

Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—
cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.
All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors'
Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the
writer. The Editor cannot undertake to return MSS.
forwarded to him.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MAY 4, 1878.

CURRENT TOPICS.

MR. EDMUND LUMLEY has been appointed a Master of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, in place of Mr. Unthank, resigned. Mr. Lumley was called to the bar in Hilary Term, 1865, and is a member of the Midland Circuit.

BY THE RESIGNATION by Mr. Unthank of the office of master, the Queen's Bench Division has lost the services of an official who has always been known as an acute and able lawyer, and for many years past has enjoyed an almost unequalled reputation for efficiency and practical skill in the discharge of his duties. We are doing no more than justice to the gentleman who succeeds to the vacant mastership when we say that the term of acute and able lawyer may be not less justly applied to him than to his predecessor, and we feel certain that his judgment, temper, and good sense will make the labours of those who have to appear before him as easy and pleasant as contests on the *apices juris* can be their nature be.

THE ORIGIN of the ancient offices of Postman and Tubman of the Exchequer Division, to which appointments have been made this week, seems difficult to trace. Within the Exchequer Court the gentlemen who hold these positions have (according to Price) pre-eminence, the one of the Attorney the other of the Solicitor-General, in all ordinary business. In 1840, in the case of *R. v. Bishop of Exeter* (7 M & W, 18), the Postman claimed precedence of the Attorney-General; but upon the Attorney-General's stating that it was the Queen's business in which he moved, the court decided that he was entitled to be heard before the Postman. The Postman and Tubman are said to be so named from the places they occupy in the court, the Postman having his "post" on the left extremity of the first row of the outer bar (the right of the bench), and the Tubman being seated in a box or "tub" on the right extremity. They are always members of the outer bar, and are nominated by the Lord Chief Baron by word of mouth in open court, but have no rank or privilege beyond its precincts (9 Foss's Judges, 110). Among the names of former holders of the offices are those of Chief Justice Jervis, Lord Penzance, Lord Justice Thesiger, and Justices Crompton, Willes, and Lush; and in Mr. Anstie a worthy successor has been found to the list of learned Postmen.

FROM VARIOUS QUARTERS rumours come of Russian projects for using against the English commercial marine, in the event of war, ships which are not part of their regular navy. The first article of the Declaration of Paris, 1856—"La course est et demeure abolie," "Privateering is and remains abolished"—prohibits the only class of ships, other than the regular navy, which was then ordinarily employed against an enemy's commerce; and

this has not unnaturally produced an idea that the effect of the article would be to limit each nation to its regular navy—i.e., to ships owned by the State, and fitted out primarily for fighting other armed vessels, not for capturing unarmed vessels. But a privateer differed from a regular ship of war, not so much in belonging to a private individual instead of to the State, or in being primarily intended, not for war, but for the capture of merchant ships, as in being under the control of this private owner, and in the officers and crew being his servants, instead of the servants of the State. The words "privateer," "course," "corsaire," are always applied to cases where the ship is under the control of a private individual holding letters of marque, and the chief objection to privateering was this absence of direct State control over the ship and crew. Moreover, though it resulted from the only remuneration to crew or owner being prize money that privateers were of late years practically fitted out only with a view to capturing an enemy's merchant ships, they were authorized to carry on war in other ways, and in earlier times—e.g., Elizabeth's reign—this was by no means their only object. If the parties to the Declaration of Paris had intended to prohibit the fitting out of vessels exclusively for capturing an enemy's merchant ships, or to restrict a nation to the use of its regular navy, it would not have been difficult to find suitable words for expressing that intention. It seems, therefore, very questionable whether the prohibition of privateering would extend to ships which, though belonging to private owners, and intended to be used only for capturing merchant ships, had been placed under the control of the State, and were officered and manned by the servants of the State.

The question has only once been raised in a practical shape—viz., by the Prussian decree for a voluntary marine issued during the Franco-German war, July 26, 1870. This decree (which will be found in the Parliamentary Papers, House of Commons, 1871, vol. 71, p. 20), invited shipowners to lend their ships for the war, receiving as remuneration ten per cent. of the value, or if the ship should be destroyed, the full value. The crews were to be hired by the owners, but were "to enter the Federal Navy for the continuance of the war, wear its uniform, acknowledge its competency, and take oath to the articles of war." In case these ships destroyed or captured ships of the enemy, certain premiums were to be paid to the owners for distribution among the crews. The French Government complained to Lord Granville, then the English Foreign Secretary, about this decree, alleging that it was, under a disguised form, the re-establishment of privateering; but Lord Granville, after consulting the then law officers—Sir Travers Twiss, Sir R. Collier, and Sir John Coleridge—replied: "They advise me that there are, in their opinion, substantial differences between the proposed naval volunteer force sanctioned by the Prussian Government and the system of privateering which, under the designation of 'la course' the Declaration of Paris was intended to suppress. The law officers say that, as far as they can judge, the vessels referred to the notification of the 24th of July will be, for all intents and purposes, in the service of the Prussian Government, and the crews will be under the same discipline as the crews on board vessels belonging permanently to the Federal Navy. This being the case now, and as long as it continues to be so, the law officers consider that her Majesty's Government cannot object to the decree of the Prussian Government as infringing the Declaration of Paris." The Prussian Government had previously announced that they did not intend to seize the enemy's merchant ships, and their minister laid stress upon this in what he said to the English Ambassador about the French complaint and Lord Granville's answer. But while this was material both for vindicating the consistency of the Prussian Government, and for removing any fears the English Government might entertain as to these vessels interfering with English merchant vessels,

it is not easy to see how it could affect the legal question whether the Prussian decree was an infringement of the Declaration of Paris. Mr. Lawrence, in the 1863 edition of Wheaton, p. 639, says, with reference to a volunteer navy established by the United States during their war with the Southern States, apparently very similar to the Prussian volunteer navy, "Can anyone doubt, if the United States were a party to the Declaration, their right of employing in a foreign war this volunteer navy for any purpose, even for the capture of private property, in which their public vessels or those of other nations might properly be engaged?"

We fear, therefore, it will be found that if the Russian Government, after obtaining from private individuals ships and crews, places them under Government officers, we shall not be able to object that they are violating the Declaration of Paris. Of course, if Americans, or any other neutrals, lend their ships for this purpose, they will probably be violating their laws corresponding to our Foreign Enlistment Act.

IN THE CASE OF *West v. White* (25 W. R. 342, L. R. 4 Ch. D. 631), in which the plaintiff complained of injury from noxious fumes issuing from the defendant's works, Vice-Chancellor Bacon refused to deprive the defendant of his right under ord. 36, r. 3, to have the case tried before a judge and jury. He said, "I find the case justifies me in saying in my discretion that the defendant should not be deprived of that right, and that the trial should not take place against his will in this court when he desires what the Act of Parliament seems to contemplate, that it should be tried before a jury." In the subsequent case of *Back v. Hay* (25 W. R. 392) Vice-Chancellor Malins, dealing with the same question of the discretion allowed to the judge by rule 26 of order 36, said "that there were many cases which were proper for a jury was of course true; for example, the question of nuisance or no nuisance raised in *West v. White*, in which the jury could have a view of the *locus in quo* while the judge could not, was one of such cases, and he thought the discretion which the court had was very properly exercised in that case." But in a case of *Brooke v. Wiggs*, on Tuesday last, in which the owner of a mansion at Chester complained of injury from noxious fumes issuing from the defendant's works, the same Vice-Chancellor refused to send the case before a jury, on the ground that the parties had agreed that the evidence should be taken by affidavit, that the evidence had been taken at great length by affidavit, and that the effect of an agreement to take evidence in this way was "that the action should be tried before a judge in the Chancery Division, and not before a jury, where the parties must have perfectly well known the affidavits could not be used." We need hardly draw the moral that if this decision is to be followed it will be necessary for parties to actions relating to alleged nuisances to exercise great caution in agreeing that the evidence shall be taken by affidavit.

THE LEGISLATURE has lost no time in remedying the effects of the judgment in *Hindhaugh v. Blakely* (26 W. R. 480). On the 2nd of March last it was held by the Common Pleas Division that a person writing his signature across the face of a bill of exchange without adding the word "accepted" was not liable as an acceptor within the Mercantile Law Amendment Act, 1856 (19 & 20 Vict. c. 97), s. 6. On the 19th of March the Attorney-General stated in the House of Commons, in answer to Mr. Stanton, that as the object of the section in question was the introduction of the Scotch law into England and Ireland, he desired to inquire into the Scotch law and practice on the subject before deciding what steps should be taken. On the 28th of March, however, Sir John Lubbock obtained leave to introduce

a Bill "to declare the law relating to the acceptance bills of exchange." This Bill was read a third time on the 9th of April, and on the 11th it was introduced in the House of Lords by the Lord Chancellor. It passed the Upper House on the 15th of April, and on the following day received the Royal assent. The preamble of the statute (41 & 42 Vict. c. 13) recites the Mercantile Law Amendment Act, 1856, s. 6, and the Mercantile Law Amendment Act (Scotland), 1856 (19 & 20 Vict. c. 60), s. 11; and that "doubts have arisen as to the true effect and intention of the said enactment, and as to whether the signature of the drawee alone can constitute a sufficient acceptance of the bill so as to satisfy the requirements of the said statute"; and section 1 enacts that "an acceptance of a bill of exchange is not, and shall not be deemed to be, insufficient under the provisions of the said statutes, by reason only that such acceptance consists merely of the signature of the drawee written on such bill."

WE HAVE OFTEN WONDERED that it has never occurred to any member of Parliament to introduce a short Bill to restrict the landlord's remedy for rent by distress in the case of small tenements. There is scarcely a week in which some piteous story of oppression in the use of the process does not come before a metropolitan police-court, and, although some of the tenants distrained on avail themselves of the summary remedy provided by 2 & 3 Vict. c. 71, it cannot be doubted that great numbers quietly endure the illegal and arbitrary acts of the brokers. The main use of the process appears, indeed, to be to benefit these individuals. This week, for instance, in a case at the Westminster Police Court it came out in evidence that the goods of the wife of a lunatic confined in an asylum had been distrained, and she had been left without a single article of furniture. The landlord said he had not received anything from the distress. The broker said "the woman had every opportunity to go, but did not avail herself of it, the goods only realized 15s., and the expenses of the man in possession and his fees amounted to that." The magistrate naturally asked what use that was to the landlord, and we may repeat the question with reference to very many of these cases. We see little objection to a provision relating to the class of premises defined in 2 & 3 Vict. c. 71, requiring the landlord to obtain the order of a magistrate before distraining on his tenant's goods.

WITH REGARD to the rules under the Prisons Act, 1877, relating to the confinement of debtors, we are allowed to be paid them, and their other privileges we are informed that new instructions have during the present week been sent to the prison authorities.

Mr. Cross has appointed Captain William H. Fenwick, Major Arthur G. F. Griffiths, Colonel Frederick George Hankin, Captain John Maitland Lennox, and Captain Henry K. Wilson, to be inspectors of prisons under the Prison Act, 1877.

The *New York Times* calls attention to a Bill laid before Congress by Senator Burnside on the 9th of April, which provides that, in the public schools of the district of Columbia, the school officers shall introduce, as part of the daily exercise of each school in their jurisdiction, instruction in the elements of social and moral science, including industry, order, economy, punctuality, patience, self-denial, health, purity, temperance, cleanliness, honesty, truth, justice, politeness, peace, fidelity, philanthropy, patriotism, self-respect, hope, perseverance, observance, courage, self-reliance, gratitude, pity, mercy, kindred, conscience, reflection, and the will. The teachers are to give a lesson every day upon one of these topics.

**TENANT'S OBLIGATION TO KEEP UP
BOUNDARIES.**

It is not a little curious that an important obligation attaching to the relation of landlord and tenant, and recognized as "long settled" at the commencement of the present century, should yet be comparatively undefined. The general principle that "a tenant contracts, among other obligations resulting from that relation, to keep distinct from his own property during his tenancy, and to leave clearly distinct at the end of it, his landlord's property, not in any way confounded with his own," was laid down by Lord Eldon in *Attorney-General v. Fullerton* (2 V. & B. 263), and he subsequently said it was "a common equity that a tenant, having put his landlord's property and his own together for his own convenience, in order to make the most of it during his tenancy, is bound at the end of the term to render up specifically the landlord's land." The meaning of this would seem to be obvious enough; the tenant may throw together for convenience of occupation his own land and his landlord's land, but he must be careful to keep up at all times during the tenancy such landmarks as will both enable himself at the end of the tenancy to distinguish accurately his landlord's land, and will also enable the landlord at any time during the tenancy to satisfy himself as to what land is his. This latter part of the obligation does not seem to have been always quite clearly kept in view in subsequent cases. Thus, in *Attorney-General v. Stephens* (4 W. R. 191; 6 D. G. M. & G. 111), Lord Cranworth, while stating it as the duty of the tenant to preserve "the metes and bounds of the demised parcels of land, so that those lands might at all times be readily distinguished from the other lands with which they lie intermixed," explained the rule as being that, "where a tenant for life or for years or at will has land of his own adjoining to that which he so held as tenant, it is his duty to keep the bounds between them clear and distinct, so that at the expiration of the tenancy the reversioner or remainderman may be able without difficulty to resume possession of what belongs to him." And in *Brown v. Wales* (22 W. R. 157, L. R. 15 Eq. 142), Wickens, V.C., said that "a lessor who, by no fault of his own, cannot distinguish the boundaries of land, may ask the lessee what it is that is to be given up." But a very little consideration shows that there are reasons which make the rule applicable during the continuance of the tenancy as well as at its expiration. If the tenant may obliterate the boundaries of his land during his tenancy, how is the landlord to know on what land he may distrain for rent, or where he may exercise the rights usually excepted and reserved in the lease? In the recent case of *Spike v. Harding* (26 W. R. 420), the question of the obligation to keep up the boundaries during the tenancy was distinctly raised, and Mr. Justice Fry held, in accordance with Lord Eldon's decision, that the obligation of the tenant applies, not merely at the end of the term when he comes to deliver up the property, but also at all times during the subsistence of the term.

But what is the tenant to keep up in the shape of boundaries? Must he necessarily keep up the actual ancient boundary? In the recent case the bank and ditch originally separating the demised land from the tenant's own land were alleged to be on the tenant's own land. The tenant levelled the bank and filled up the ditch, and so obliterated the boundary. According to Mr. Justice Fry, he was not necessarily bound to keep up the hedge and ditch. He must either keep up that boundary or some other boundary which would render the two properties clearly distinct. It is a little difficult to see how, after the complete obliteration of the hedge and ditch, the landlord could, as Lord Eldon said, in *Attorney-General v. Fullerton*, "go to some land which he can demonstrate as his own," or be restored to land "which is unquestionably his." With great deference, we should think that there must be sufficient traces of

the ancient fence left to enable the landlord at all times during the tenancy and at its close to satisfy himself as to the limits of his land.

The mode formerly adopted by the court of ascertaining boundaries confused by the tenant was by commission, following the course pursued in the case of copyholds which had become confounded with freehold lands (*Duke of Leeds v. Earl of Strafford*, 4 Ves. 180). But in the recent case counsel on both sides agreed in urging upon the court the advisability of substituting an inquiry in chambers for the old procedure by commission. They said that the principles on which the court directs a commission to ascertain boundaries and a commission to make a partition are the same; that the practice as to partition had, since 1852, changed; that commissions to make a partition were now almost obsolete; and that, on the same principle, commissions should be abandoned in questions of boundary. The learned judge, accordingly, instead of directing a commission to issue, referred it to chambers to ascertain the boundaries between the premises belonging to the lessee and the premises comprised in the lease to him.

A question not touched upon in the recent case is what is to be done if upon a commission or inquiry in chambers it is found impossible to distinguish the boundaries. The rule here was very clearly laid down by Lord Eldon in *Attorney-General v. Fullerton*: "If the tenant has so confounded the boundaries, sub-dividing the land by hedges and stones and destroying the metes and bounds, that the landlord's land cannot be ascertained, the court will inquire what was the value of the landlord's estate, valued fairly, but to the utmost, as against that tenant who has himself destroyed the possibility of the landlord having his own," and then (see the judgment in *Attorney-General v. Stephens*) there will be set out under the commission such a piece of the tenant's own land as will be of equal value to the land originally demised, and this piece must be conveyed to the landlord.

Mr. Nairne, second clerk at the Marlborough-street Police-court, has been appointed chief clerk at Southwark Police-court.

In the Liverpool Court of Passage, on Tuesday, before Mr. Baylis, Q.C., assessor, a case was heard in which a seaman named Peter Severa sued the owners of the vessel *Tonawanda* for £21 11s. 4d., balance of wages. A question was raised as to whether the court had jurisdiction. Some action had been taken in the matter in dispute between the plaintiff and defendants by the American consul at Liverpool, *The Tonawanda* being an American vessel, and before the case came on for hearing the American consul addressed a remonstrance to the learned assessor against the case being heard in his court. The statement of defence alleged that the plaintiff deserted from the ship at Liverpool. His Honour said he was of opinion that the suit must be dismissed, for he felt bound to entertain the protest of the consul addressed to him personally. He had a discretion in the matter admittedly, and in a case a short time ago he exercised that discretion in a suit for wages. It was a case in which he thought that a consul was not a disinterested party, and so should not be a judge in his own case. In this case it did not appear at all that there was any interest on the part of the consul. The plaintiff had embarked at Mobile on an American ship, and at this port the dispute as to wages arose. It seems a long time had elapsed—between the 19th of June, 1877, and the institution of the suit, the 9th of February, 1878—but there might be reasons for that. He thought it was highly important that the consul or officer of a country should dispose of such cases as these between the master and crew or owners and crew of a ship. The consul's protest, being delivered before the case came on for hearing, was in time; and the consul not only protested because he had himself adjudicated on the case, but because the plaintiff was a seaman of the United States. The objection his honour held to be valid, and as this prohibition, so to speak, was laid upon him, he could not proceed with the case.

Reviews.

PRISONS.

THE LAW OF PRISONS IN ENGLAND AND WALES, &c., &c. By ROBERT WILKINSON, of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law. Knight & Co.

The author of this work is evidently enamoured of the new prison system and somewhat needlessly depreciates the worth of the old system, which certainly gave greater scope to the managing and directing abilities of local authorities, and promoted those feelings of individual responsibility which have, in the past, formed a most important part of our national life. In his preface the difference between the duties of visiting committees and visiting justices is not correctly estimated. When the committee are deprived of power to appoint or remove the meanest officer, to make any alteration in the prison edifice, or to make a contract for even a bag of meal, it cannot be correctly said that "the principal difference in their position may, indeed, be said to consist in the fact that they will in future possess the supervision of the prisons under the Secretary of State, instead of being subject to the authority of the 'justices in sessions assembled.'" The importance of the change effected is nowhere better shown than in the following paragraph which occurs in the new rules approved by the Secretary of State:—

"It must be understood that, although the words 'justices in sessions assembled,' 'visiting justices,' &c. are retained in the extracts from the Prison Act, 1865, the former no longer exercise the powers given in that Act, and the latter are abolished entirely. The commissioners of prisons exercise all the powers formerly vested in visiting justices, and the visiting committee exercise only such of them as are given in section 14, sub-section 2, of the Prison Act, 1877, together with such other powers as are specified in the rules made by the Secretary of State and printed in italics."

The second part of the volume contains a valuable analysis of the Prison Acts of 1865 and 1877, showing where one supersedes the other, and pointing out how the combined regulations of the two Acts may be carried into effect. The various Acts and schedules relating in any way to prison management are afterwards set forth *in extenso* with occasional foot notes elucidating the text, and especially pointing out where the Act of 1877 modifies or alters the Act of 1865. This will be very useful, as the two Acts overlap so much as to make it difficult to understand which powers are continued, and which are modified or abolished; and this is the more confusing as the old term "visiting justices" is continually used, whilst all or nearly all their functions are now performed by the commissioners.

The last seventy-one pages of the volume contain a very complete index, which will probably be found not the least useful part of the work.

In one respect, the work before us is necessarily incomplete, for the regulations under the Act of last session are still imperfect. The dietary tables are not yet issued; there appears to be some doubt on this head as to the proper system to be adopted, and the late prison authorities, so far as provisions, &c., are concerned, are to exercise their old functions until the 15th of May. The commissioners have also yet to decide upon various matters in relation to untried prisoners, prisoners under remand, persons in gaol in default of sureties, &c. The justices in one borough resigned because they were not allowed the services of their clerk; this caused the issue of a short supplemental notice, which, with others of a similar character, are not to be found in this volume. As to what and when the visiting committees are to report to the Secretary of State, no instructions have yet been furnished. In many instances where matters are referred to a visiting committee it is left in doubt whether one

or more members may act on behalf of the whole body, which it would be manifestly impossible always to call together when exigencies occur, such as, for instance, a question as to the punishment necessary to be inflicted on refractory prisoners. These, and other matters arising from the establishment of a new system involving serious changes of administration, call for new regulations, and these must soon render necessary a revised edition of the work before us.

General Correspondence.

LAND FRAUDS AND REGISTRATION.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal*.]

Sir,—In your recent notice of Downs' case, you refer to a number of instances of fraudulent dealings with land in the various home counties other than Middlesex, and add this comment: "The rogues, whether reasonably or unreasonably, do, as a matter of fact, avoid the register county, notwithstanding that the state of the register is such as to render it a most inefficient protection." You might have extended your list of "rogues" by adding the name of David Hughes, whose land frauds were as extensive as those of Roupell and Downs put together, and who operated almost exclusively in Middlesex, and managed to make of the register a most efficient auxiliary.

A. E. M.

"A NEW JUSTICE IN EYRE."

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal*.]

Sir,—If "Examined," whose letter under this title appears at p. 490, will kindly say how seventy-four men are to be examined singly in less than eight hours, unless the *vivæ voce* examination is to be a mere farce, he will confer a real boon upon

THE EXAMINER.

Cases of the Week.

PRACTICE—STRIKING OUT INTERROGATORIES—SCANDAL AND IRRELEVANCE—ANSWERS TENDING TO CRIMINATE—ORD. 31, RR. 5, 8.—In a case of *Fisher v. Owen*, decided by the Court of Appeal on the 30th ult., a question of importance arose as to the proper course to be followed where a person to whom interrogatories have been delivered thinks that they are of such a nature that, if he is compelled to answer them, his answers may tend to criminate himself. The action was brought to set aside a deed of gift, which a testatrix had, on her death bed, executed in favour of the defendant, it being alleged that she had done so in ignorance of its contents, and while she was in a state of stupor produced by a narcotic drug which had been administered to her by the defendant in concert with a medical man. By her statement of defence the defendant denied the charges *in toto*. The plaintiff delivered interrogatories for the examination of the defendant of a very searching character, founded on the allegations contained in the statement of claim. The defendant applied by summons to Bacon, V.C., to have the interrogatories struck out as being (in the words of rule 5 of order 31) "scandalous and irrelevant, and not put *bond & side* for the purposes of the action," and as being bad in substance, and upon other grounds. The objection taken in argument to the interrogatories was that the answers to them might tend to expose the defendant to a criminal prosecution, and on this ground the Vice-Chancellor held that the interrogatories were scandalous and irrelevant, and ordered them all to be struck out, without prejudice to the right of the plaintiff to deliver proper interrogatories (*vide* 26 W. R. 417). In the Court of Appeal the defendant's counsel relied upon the decision of the Queen's Bench Division in *Atherley v. Harvey* (25 W. R. 727, L. R. 2 Q. B. D. 524), where it was held in an action for libel that interrogatories asking the defendant whether he had composed or published the

alleged libel ought to be struck out, without requiring the defendant to object to them by way of answer. It was also urged that the allowance or disallowance of interrogatories was a matter within the discretion of the judge of first instance, and that the Court of Appeal would not interfere with the exercise of his discretion. Reliance was also placed on a *dictum*, or rather a suggestion, of Baggallay, L.J., in *Saunders v. Jones* (26 W. R. 226, L. R. 7 Ch. D. 435), to the effect that, if a defendant had not applied to strike out an interrogatory, he could not afterwards object to answer it. The Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and Cotton and Thesiger, L.J.J.) held that the interrogatories ought not to have been struck out, but that the defendant ought to have been left to assert her privilege (as provided by rule 8 of order 31) of refusing to answer any question, the answer to which might tend to criminate herself. Jessel, M.R., said that rule 5 had no application to such a case, it only applied to cases where the interrogatories were in themselves objectionable. In such a case as this the fact that the answers to interrogatories might tend to criminate a defendant would have been no ground under the ancient practice of the Court of Chancery for saying that he should not have the election to answer or not to answer them. In most cases of such a nature the defendant would deny the charge with indignation. By striking out the interrogatories the plaintiff would be prevented from putting the questions. If the defendant was being examined as a witness in the box, the plaintiff could not be prevented from putting such questions, though the defendant would have a right to decline to answer. The old practice of the Court of Chancery had not in this respect been altered by the new rules. The matters referred to in rule 5, in substance, included everything which was formerly known as "scandal and impropriety," though the meaning had been extended so as to include what came in substance, though not technically, within that description. The words "or on any other ground" did not give the judge a discretion to strike out any interrogatory if he thought fit to do so. He must see that the interrogatory was in itself objectionable; it was not a ground of objection that the answer might tend to criminate the person interrogated. His lordship did not mean to say that in a case where the great majority of interrogatories were clearly objectionable the judge might not strike them all out, without being bound to examine them in detail in order to see whether some of them might not be unobjectionable. But in the present case the Vice-Chancellor had acted upon a wrong principle. Cotton, L.J., said that he quite agreed in thinking that appeals ought to be discouraged in cases where there had been a mere exercise of discretion by the judge of first instance, but in the present case the Vice-Chancellor had no right to exercise a discretion. It could not be said that the interrogatories were scandalous or irrelevant, for nothing was scandalous which was relevant, and they were clearly put *bond fide* for the purposes of the action. And, if it was said that the latter words of rule 5, "or on any other ground" applied, his lordship was of opinion that the proper course for the defendant to take was not to apply to strike out the interrogatories, but to decline to answer them. What was said by Baggallay, L.J., in *Saunders v. Jones*, was a mere *dictum*, not a decision, and there was really no ground for saying that a person would be precluded from objecting to answer an interrogatory by the fact that he had not applied to have it struck out. *Atherley v. Harvey* was really no authority, for it was clear that the judges of the Queen's Bench Division thought that they were applying the old rule in the Court of Chancery, that a bill of discovery would not be allowed in aid of an action for a personal tort. They had, in his lordship's opinion, applied that rule wrongly. It had no application to an action which had been properly brought in the Chancery Division. Thesiger, L.J., said that the practice in the courts of common law before the Judicature Act was really the same as the practice in the Court of Chancery. The old decisions at common law could be reconciled, and could be placed on this intelligible basis, viz., that where there was an interrogatory which tended to criminate or discredit the person interrogated, it was the duty of the court to see that it was put *bond fide* for the purpose of establishing the case of the party who put it, and for the purpose of supporting, not a mere fishing case, but a definite issue raised by the pleadings. The Judicature Act had made no alteration in the practice in this respect. It was impossible to say that interrogatories of such a character

were scandalous or impertinent, if they were relevant to the case set up by the pleadings.

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE—CONDITIONAL CONTRACT "SUBJECT TO THE TITLE BEING APPROVED" BY PURCHASER'S SOLICITOR.—In another case of *Hussey v. Horne Payne*, heard the same day, a question arose similar to that which was raised before Fry, J., in the recent case of *Hudson v. Buck* (26 W. R. 190, *ante*, p. 132, L. R. 7 Ch. D. 683). The action was for the specific performance of an alleged contract by the defendant to sell some freehold land to the plaintiff. The contract was contained in two letters, the first by the defendant to the plaintiff's agent offering to sell the land for £37,500; the second by the plaintiff's agent to the defendant accepting the offer, but adding "subject to the title being approved by our solicitors." The defendant demurred to the statement of claim, and the demurser was overruled by Malins, V.C., but the ground upon which it was sought to sustain it in the Court of Appeal was not taken before him. In the Court of Appeal it was urged that the words above quoted meant that the judgment of the purchaser's solicitor as to the goodness of the defendant's title was to be conclusive, and *Hudson v. Buck* was cited as an authority for that construction. The letter of the plaintiff's agent, therefore, it was said, did not amount to a simple acceptance of the defendant's offer, but introduced a new term, and, as the defendant had never assented to this term, a concluded agreement had not been entered into. The court (Jessel, M.R., and Cotton and Thesiger, L.J.J.) approved of *Hudson v. Buck*, and on this ground they allowed the demurser. The decision is one of considerable practical importance, as settling the construction of a clause which is of very common occurrence in contracts for the sale of land, and showing that it does not mean the same thing as a provision that a good title shall be shown.

SALE BY MORTGAGOR IN POSSESSION—WHAT IS "USUAL ACCOUNT" AGAINST—WILFUL DEFAULT.—In a case of *Mayer v. Murray*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 1st inst., a question arose as to what was the "usual account" against a mortgagor in possession where part of the property had been sold, and the proceeds of sale received by the mortgagee. No allegation of any wilful default was charged on the pleadings against the mortgagor, nor was any such proved at the trial. The minutes, as drawn by the registrar, directed an account of rents and profits, and of the proceeds of any sales received by the mortgagor or which, but for his wilful default, he might have received. The Master of the Rolls was of opinion that the minutes were correct, and that a mortgagor in possession was always chargeable with wilful default, and (unlike the case of an ordinary trustee) whether such was charged in the pleadings or not. The principle was correctly stated in *Fisher on Mortgages*, at p. 943, that "the account usually directed against a mortgagor in possession, either of tangible property or of a business, was of what he had, or without wilful default might have, received from the time of his taking possession." In the cases cited he could find no direct decision on the subject, although in *Williams v. Price* (1 Sim. & S. 581) and *Kensington v. Bowyer* (7 De G. M. & G. 156), the principle was distinctly recognized. Under the above account the mortgagor was, of course, only liable for the proceeds of any sale, and not for a sale at an undervalue. If it was desired to impeach the sale on that or any other ground, that would have to be done by a separate proceeding, and must be mentioned in the pleadings and proved at the trial. The "usual account" would not entitle the mortgagor or his representatives to impeach any sale by the mortgagee.

PRACTICE—STATEMENT OF CLAIM—NON-DELIVERY THROUGH SLIP OF CLERK—ENLARGEMENT OF TIME—RULES OF COURT, 1875, ORD. 21, R. 1A—ORD. 57, R. 6.—In a case of *The Canadian Oil Wells Corporation Ltd. v. Hay*, before Malins, V.C., on the 30th ult., the question raised in *Burgoyne v. Taylor* (*ante*, p. 445), as to the liability of the parties for slips made by the clerks of their solicitors, again arose. The writ in the action was issued in August, 1877, just in time to save the Statute of Limitations from running, and was served on the 12th of

February, 1878. The defendant Hay appeared on the 20th of February, and the two other defendants on the 22nd and 25th respectively. A clerk of the solicitors of the plaintiffs misreading ord. 21, r. 1a, counted the time for the delivery of Hay's statement of claim from the 25th of February, the last appearance, instead of the 20th, the date of his appearance, and in consequence of such mistake did not deliver Hay's statement of claim until two days too late. On the defendant's refusal to accept delivery a summons was taken out for liberty to deliver the same, but by the mistake of another clerk the plaintiffs' solicitors did not attend the summons, and it was dismissed. A motion was made on the 30th ult., under ord. 57, r. 6, that the time for delivery might be enlarged, notwithstanding that it had expired. The plaintiffs contended that they came within the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Burgoin v. Taylor*, and that they ought not to be held responsible for the mere slips of their solicitors' clerks. The defendant Hay, on the other hand, argued that this came within the principle of the extension of time for appealing, as to which no slips made any difference, and further that the effect of allowing this application would be to deprive him of the effect of his statutory bar under the Statute of Limitations. The Vice-Chancellor, following *Burgoin v. Taylor*, was clearly of opinion that the above slips were not sufficient to deprive the plaintiffs of the benefit of their action, and he accordingly ordered the delivery of the statement of claim to stand, on the terms of the plaintiffs paying the costs of the summons. As the defendant had acted somewhat unreasonably in refusing to accede to the plaintiffs' previous offer on those terms, he did not give him the costs of the motion. He would, of course, have time for the delivery of his statement of defence.

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the usual weekly meeting of this society, held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, on Tuesday evening last, the 30th of April, Mr. A. M. Ellis, LL.B., in the chair, the question appointed for the evening's debate was—"Should the existing restrictions on the admission of women to professions be removed?" Mr. Eady, LL.D., opened the discussion, maintaining the negative, and was followed by Mr. Lloyd Jones. An animated debate ensued, the removal of the present restrictions being ably advocated by Mr. S. Gargett and Mr. Bird. The opener replied, and the question was put to the meeting, and decided by a majority of votes in the negative.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

At a meeting of this society, held at the Law Institution on April 29, Mr. Frank B. Moyle, in the chair, the following legal moot was discussed:—"Can a voluntary conveyance to a charity be avoided by a subsequent sale for value?" Mr. E. H. Quick supported the affirmative, which was carried, after a full discussion of the moot by the members present.

The usual weekly meeting was held at Clements'-inn Hall on Wednesday, Mr. Pickersgill presiding. The chairman during the meeting presented a handsome set of legal works to Mr. W. H. Hazard, the winner of the Davis prize for the year 1877. Some important motions were afterwards brought before the society, and the meeting adjourned at a late hour.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The fortieth half-yearly general meeting of the members of this association was held on Wednesday last, May 1, at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, for the purpose of receiving from the board of directors their report and statement of accounts for the past-half year, and for the transaction of other business; Mr. E. Hedger, chairman of the board of directors, presiding.

The notice of meeting and the minutes of the previous half-yearly meeting having been read by the secretary (Mr. Ellice,) the following report, as printed and circulated, was taken as read:—

"The board of directors, in compliance with the 16th

rule of the association, present this their fortieth half-yearly report of its progress and work.

" Since October last, 24 life and 73 annual members have been admitted to the association, and the aggregate number of members enrolled is now 2,487, of whom 911 are life, and 1,526 annual subscribers. Forty-one life members contribute also annual subscriptions of from one to five guineas each.

" The receipts of the association during the half-year, added to the balance of £444 15s. 11d. brought from the previous account, have amounted to £2,051 19s. 11d., and the board desire gratefully to record the following donations from members and other friends of the association, viz.—two guineas from the Most Noble the Marquis Townshend; ten guineas from the Denbighshire and Flintshire Law Society; five guineas from the Hon. Society of Staple Inn, London; an annual donation of five pounds from Miss Capes, daughter of a deceased London member of the board; and ten guineas from Mr. Richard T. S. Andrew, of Tunbridge Wells, a life member of the association since 1863. The board have the pleasure also of reporting the following donations and subscriptions received since the account was closed, viz.—Sixty-five pounds from the Right Hon. Sir Samuel Martin; five pounds from Mr. Nathaniel Tertius Lawrence, of London, a life member of the association since 1859, and a member of the board; twenty-five guineas from Mr. William Evans, of Birmingham, a life member of the association since 1853; ten pounds from Mr. George Burrow Gregory, M.P., a life member of the association since 1866, and likewise a member of the board; twenty pounds from Mr. Ralph Stevenson, of Little Haywood, Stafford; and twenty guineas from Mr. John North, of Leeds.

" During the past half-year the board have distributed a sum of £960 in relief; £470 of which were bestowed, in grants of from £20 to £60, upon twelve applicants of the primary class—that of members and their families; and £490, in grants of from £5 to £25, upon forty-three applicants of the secondary class—that of non-members and their families.

" A sum of £479 1s. 3d. has been invested in the purchase of £500 reduced three per cent. annuities; and at the closing of the account, a balance of £316 4s. 4d. remained to the credit of the association with the Union Bank of London, and a sum of £15 in the secretary's hands.

" The funded capital of the association consists of £3,000 consols; £2,500 reduced annuities; £3,000 India five per cents.; £1,000 India four per cents.; £4,207 London and North-Western Railway four per cent. perpetual debenture stock; and £250 London and St. Katherine Docks four per cent. debenture stock; making a total of £33,957 stock, producing annual dividends amounting to £1,316 12s. 3d.

" As already announced, the board have much pleasure in stating that the Right Hon. the Master of the Rolls (Sir George Jessel) has kindly consented to preside at the ensuing anniversary festival to be held on Wednesday, the 26th of June next, at the Star and Garter Hotel, Richmond, Surrey. The list of gentlemen who have already given their names as stewards and to be present at the dinner is less numerous than the board could have desired, but they earnestly trust that there will be a large accession thereto, and that they will have the hearty co-operation of the profession generally in their endeavours to carry the festival to a prosperous issue."

The CHAIRMAN, in moving the adoption of the report, said that, although the present position of the association could not be said to render it the worthy representative society of the entire body of solicitors of England and Wales, still considering it had not as yet attained its majority, its progress must be looked upon as being eminently satisfactory. The directors had been enabled to put by a capital of nearly £35,000, and to increase the grants from £10 in the year 1861 to the sum of £2,224 5s. in the last financial year; but he would, in urging the members and the profession generally not to release their efforts on behalf of the association, point out that the benevolent institutions supported by the other professions were provided with schools, and he hoped that at a future time the Solicitors' Benevolent Association would represent their great profession even more worthily than it did at present.

There was one other subject he would just allude to, and which was the question that had already been before the members of the association, he meant the question of amalgamation with the Law Association. He had had the honour of a seat on that board for many years, and believed

that
and
the
due
T.
E.
M.
give
off t
condi
said
detai
ventu
for h
conve
to re
their
resolu
ente
and h
prosp
that t
books
presen
regard
to pre
of the
of one
of fut
make i
to join
law so
by som
Mr.
the sa
The
by the
the cha
associat

Mr. J.
of the
Everard
College,
London
examina
Michael
reporters
Mr. Ans
the offic

Mr. W.
appointed
Property
the elder
Q.C., just
educated
at the U
the bar a
and prac
He became
the Middle

Mr. F.
and Hartle
for the Ba
Mr. Sam
Chandler

Mr. ALI
Parliamen
Good Hop
Temple in
member o

Mr. H.
ham, ha

it was only a small minority which prevented such amalgamation taking place. This was a subject which specially lay with the general body of the two associations, and it was for them to educate the respective boards as to their desires and wishes, and which would doubtless receive due attention.

The adoption of the report, having been seconded by Mr. F. H. JANSON, was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. SIDNEY SMITH then moved, in pursuance of a notice given by him, "That any future member who shall be struck off the roll of the Supreme Court of Judicature for improper conduct shall cease to be a member of this association." He said he did not think that it would be necessary for him to detain the meeting very long in moving the resolution, as he ventured to believe that when a member had, unfortunately for himself and for their body as a profession, been publicly convicted of a crime, it would hardly be thought desirable to retain him as a member, or have his name appearing in their printed lists. He had been induced to put forward his resolution in consequence of the recent conviction and sentence to penal servitude of a member of the association, and he should have been glad if he could have framed his resolution so as to give to it a retrospective as well as a prospective operation, for he thought it was not creditable that the names of such persons should be borne upon the books of their societies. He should like, also, to see the present rule 3 more strictly interpreted by the board with regard to the approval of applicants for admission, in order to prevent persons of doubtful reputation becoming members of the association by the payment merely of a subscription of one or ten guineas; and he thought it might be worthy of future consideration, whether it would not be well to make it a provision of their rules that a solicitor desiring to join this association should either be a member of some law society, or be proposed as a fit and proper person by some other member.

Mr. PHILIP RICKMAN having seconded the resolution, the same was, after some general conversation, agreed to, by a majority of eleven votes to two.

The proceedings were then brought to a termination by the usual votes of thanks to the directors, auditors, and the chairman of the meeting for their services to the association.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. JAMES ANSTIE, barrister, has been appointed Postman of the Exchequer Division, in succession to Mr. Richard Everard Webster, Q.C. Mr. Anstie was educated at King's College, London, and graduated B.A. at the University of London in 1856. He obtained a studentship at the bar examination, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1859. He was for many years one of the reporters for the *Law Reports* in the Court of Exchequer. Mr. Anstie is a member of the Oxford Circuit, and has held the office of Tubman of the Exchequer Division.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY GUNNING BAGSHAWE, Q.C., has been appointed an Examiner in Equity and the Law of Real Property to the University of London. Mr. Bagshawe is the eldest son of the late Mr. Henry Ridgard Bagshawe, Q.C., judge of the Clerkenwell County Court. He was educated at St. Mary's College, Ossett, and graduated B.A. at the University of London in 1843. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1843, and practised as an equity draftsman and conveyancer. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1874, and is a bencher of the Middle Temple.

Mr. FRANCIS SAMUEL CHANDLER, solicitor, of Basingstoke and Hartley Row, has been appointed Clerk to the Magistrates for the Borough of Basingstoke, in the place of his father, Mr. Samuel Chandler, who has resigned. Mr. F. S. Chandler was admitted a solicitor in 1876.

Mr. ALFRED WHALLEY COLE, barrister, has been appointed Parliamentary Draftsman for the colony of the Cape of Good Hope. Mr. Cole was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Hilary Term, 1850, and he was till recently a member of the House of Assembly for the colony.

Mr. HENRY DICKINSON CROMPTON, solicitor, of Birmingham, has been elected Clerk to the Kings Norton Highway

Board, in succession to his late partner, Mr. Woollaston John Burnam, deceased.

Mr. CHARLES HALL, barrister, has been appointed Tubman of the Exchequer, in succession to Mr. James Anstie, who has been appointed Postman. Mr. Hall is the son of Vice-Chancellor Sir Charles Hall. He is an M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1866. He is a member of the South-Eastern Circuit, and a few months ago he succeeded Lord Justice Theobald in the office of Attorney-General to the Prince of Wales.

Mr. EDWARD ROBERT HENLEY, solicitor, of Calne, has been appointed Clerk to the County Magistrates for the Calne Division, in succession to the late Mr. Richard Clarkson, deceased. Mr. Henley was admitted a solicitor in 1874, and is also town clerk of Calne, clerk to the Calne Board of Guardians, and clerk to the Highway Board.

Mr. JOHN HOLYOAKE, solicitor, of Droitwich, has been appointed a Magistrate for that Borough. Mr. Holyoake was admitted a solicitor in 1838, and is mayor of Droitwich for the present year, as he was also for the years 1859 and 1860.

Mr. JAMES GWINN HUTCHINSON, solicitor, of Bradford, has been elected Coroner for that Borough, in the place of Mr. Thomas Tenior, resigned. Mr. Hutchinson was admitted a solicitor in 1858.

Mr. WILLIAM SQUIRE BARKER KAYE, Q.C., LL.D., has been appointed a Police Magistrate for the City of Dublin, in succession to Mr. Thomas Henry Barton, deceased. Mr. Kaye was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he graduated B.A. in 1854, and LL.D. in 1865. He was called to the bar in Ireland in 1855, and became a Queen's Counsel in 1877. He is a member of the North-East Circuit, and has been for some time senior prosecuting counsel for the county of Armagh.

Mr. JOHN SEDGWICK, solicitor, of Watford, has been appointed Registrar of the Watford County Court (Circuit No. 37), in the place of Mr. Richard Pugh, deceased. Mr. Sedgwick was admitted a solicitor in 1834, and is in partnership with Mr. Henry Morten Turner.

Mr. WILLIAM EDMUND SLAUGHTER, solicitor (of the firm of Slaughter & Colegrave), of 6, Mansfield-street, Portland Place, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature in England.

Mr. LOFTUS TOTTENHAM, of the Bengal Civil Service, has been appointed to act as a Judge of the High Court of Judicature at Calcutta.

Obituary.

MR. JOHN GARLICK BALL.

Mr. John Garlick Ball, solicitor, died at his residence, Castle Bank, Stroud, on the 25th ult., after a long illness. Mr. Ball was born at Horsey in 1793, and was admitted a solicitor in 1814. He practised for over thirty years at Minchinhampton, but afterwards removed to Stroud, where he resided until his death, though he still had offices at Minchinhampton, as well as at Nailsworth and at Painswick. In 1831, he became a candidate for the office of coroner for the Stroud district of Gloucestershire, and after a severe struggle was returned at the head of the poll, and he retained the office until his death. Mr. Ball had a large practice in the town and neighbourhood of Stroud. He was a commissioner of oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature, a perpetual commissioner for Gloucestershire, and deputy-registrar of the Stroud County Court. He was also agent for the Gloucestershire estates of Earl Ducie, and steward of the manors of Wickwar, Charlfield, Croutham, Woodchester, Kingstanley, and Nympsfield. Mr. Ball's health had for many months been failing, and his son and partner, Mr. Alfred John Morten Ball (who was admitted in 1875), had acted as his deputy in the office of coroner. The deceased was an active member of the Liberal party, and in his younger days took a warm interest in the proceedings of the Anti-Slavery Association.

New Orders, &c.**EXTRADITION ACT, 1870.**

The *Gazette* of April 30 contains an order directing that "The Extradition Act, Tasmania, 1877," shall have effect in the colony of Tasmania, without modification or alteration, as if it were part of "The Extradition Act, 1870."

COUNTY COURTS.**THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869.**

Whereas by an order made under "The Bankruptcy Act, 1869," on the first day of January, 1870, by the Right Hon. William Page, Baron Hatherley, as the then Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, the county courts of Pembrokeshire, holden at Haverfordwest, Narberth, and Pembroke Dock, were excluded from having jurisdiction in bankruptcy, and their districts were for the purposes of such jurisdiction, attached to the county court of Carmarthenshire, holden at Carmarthen.

And whereas it appears expedient to the Lord Chancellor that the county court of Pembrokeshire, holden at Pembroke Dock, should no longer be excluded from having jurisdiction in bankruptcy, and that the districts of the county courts of Pembrokeshire, holden at Haverfordwest, Narberth, and Pembroke Dock, shall no longer be attached for bankruptcy purposes to the county court of Carmarthenshire, holden at Carmarthen.

Now, therefore, I, the Right Honourable Hugh MacAlmont, Baron Cairns, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do, by virtue of the powers vested in me by "The Bankruptcy Act, 1869," hereby revoke and alter the said order made on the first day of January, 1870, so far as the said order excludes the said county court of Pembrokeshire, holden at Pembroke Dock, from having jurisdiction in bankruptcy; and so far as the said order attaches its district, and the districts of the county courts of Pembrokeshire, holden at Haverfordwest and Narberth, for purposes of bankruptcy to the county court of Carmarthenshire, holden at Carmarthen.

And I do order that the district of the county courts of Pembrokeshire, holden at Haverfordwest and Narberth, shall be attached for the purposes of bankruptcy to the county court of Pembrokeshire, holden at Pembroke Dock, which latter county court shall have jurisdiction in bankruptcy, as provided by the said Bankruptcy Act, so far as regards any proceedings in bankruptcy, which shall hereafter be commenced in the said court.

And I do further order that this order shall take effect on, and from, the 1st day of June, 1878.

Given under my hand this 25th day of April, 1878.

CAIRNS, C.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869.

Whereas by an order made under "The Bankruptcy Act, 1869," on the first day of January, 1870, by the Right Honourable William Page, Baron Hatherley, as the then Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, the county court of Hampshire, holden at Alton, was excluded from having jurisdiction in bankruptcy, and its district was, for the purposes of such jurisdiction, attached to the county court of Surrey, holden at Guildford.

And whereas it appears expedient to the Lord Chancellor that the district of the said county court of Hampshire, holden at Alton, should no longer be attached for the purposes of bankruptcy to the county court of Surrey, holden at Guildford, but should be attached for such purposes to the county court of Hampshire, holden at Winchester.

Now, therefore, I, the Right Honourable Hugh MacAlmont, Baron Cairns, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do, by virtue of the powers vested in me by "The Bankruptcy Act, 1869," hereby revoke and alter the said order made on the first day of January, 1870, so far as the said order attaches the district of the county court of Hampshire, holden at Alton, for purposes of bankruptcy, to the county court of Surrey, holden at Guildford.

And I do order that the district of the county court of Hampshire, holden at Alton, shall be attached for the purposes of bankruptcy to the county court of Hampshire, holden at Winchester.

And I do further order that this order shall take effect on, and from, the first day of June, 1878.
Given under my hand this 25th day of April, 1878.

CAIRNS, C.

Law Students' Journal.**COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.****EASTER EXAMINATION, 1878.**

GENERAL EXAMINATION OF STUDENTS OF THE INNS OF COURT, held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th of April, 1878.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to the following students certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public examination:—

Alfred Arnold, Charles Milner Atkinson, John Eldon Babkies, Hon. Robert Preston Bruce, Cecil Maurice Chapman, Francis John Collinson, William Royston Court, Edward Knowles Corrie, William Otto Adolph Julius Danckwerts, Frederick Thomas Fraser, Richard William Shepton Giddy, Hugh Montgomerie Hamilton, Richard Donne Hancock, Henry Marmaduke Hewitt, Alfred William Spence Hitchman, Frederick Morgan Humphrey, Henry Robert Knipe, Norman Jackson Martin, Arthur Peters, Sidney Lovell Hipson, Dalzell Tawzia Savary, Harry Haddon Wickes Sparham, Alfred Tillotson, and John James Warren, of the Inner Temple; Thomas Baynes, George Vere Benson, Roland Butler, Walter Derham, Henry Amelius Adams Gridley, Arthur Morris Lloyd, Edward William O'Donoghue Manson, William Nethersole, Arthur James Parker, Charles Peile, Ross Scott, Henry Arthur Smith, John Turner, and Nash Hamilton Williams, of the Middle Temple; Henry Cleke Brown, John George Butcher, Henry Scott Ryan Goodeve Chackerbutty, John Fort, Charles Reginald Hoffmeister, Henry Seton Karr, Herbert Woodfield Paul, William John Sparrow, John Darke Stanton, Charles Harrison Tindal, and Ebenezer Samuel Wilkins, of Lincoln's-inn; and William Edmund Ball, Reinhold Gregorowski, William Foote Husband, Charles Alfred Russell, George Horton Sheppard, and Thomas Speechly, of Gray's-inn, Esqs.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Roman law only:—W. M. Acworth, R. R. Adams, R. N. Arkle, E. Berger, M. J. Blake, S. C. Boulter, T. J. Bowles, H. F. Boyd, T. de M. L. Braddell, W. S. Branker, E. F. A. Briggs, J. J. Brown, H. Brougham, S. W. Cearns, R. S. B. H. Chambers, F. Cheshire, J. Coen, W. M. Colles, J. Courroux, J. G. Cox, T. P. H. Daniel, W. A. Daniel, J. Davidson, W. M. De Saram, A. K. Dibb, T. C. Down, E. C. Dumblton, J. C. Eckersley, H. I. Falk, V. de S. Folke, J. A. Flyer, V. Gibbs, R. Goddard, E. W. Godfrey, J. D. Gordon, J. C. Graham, R. B. Haldane, S. B. R. Hawkins, F. W. Head, E. Henn, C. V. Hickie, T. L. Higgins, W. Hobson, H. W. P. Hoskyns, J. T. Hutchinson, J. H. Ireland, F. H. Irvine, A. R. Johnson, E. H. G. Kelso, C. V. Knightley, M. O. S. G. Kowalski, E. F. Lankester, B. E. Lawrence, A. D. Lawrie, E. Layman, G. A. Leon, E. R. Lovey, P. Macgregor, F. M. C. MacKarness, H. C. H. Mann, J. McDonald, H. S. G. Miles, H. Milton, P. Molyneux, H. W. Monckton, J. L. G. Mowatt, R. Mukerji, C. G. Nottage, J. Ogle, J. L. Pole, E. Ponsonby, C. A. Pope, J. Powell, E. W. Pregrave, P. C. C. Radcliffe, F. G. Randolph, J. S. O. Robertson-Luxford, H. H. Rose, H. Ross, E. A. Sayers, T. V. Scully, R. C. Seaton, S. H. Shadbolt, S. Shephard, W. S. Sichel, C. L. Smith, G. E. Smith, H. F. Speed, E. F. S. Stanhope, J. J. Stansfield, A. W. Stirling, N. J. Synott, G. Tahourdin, H. G. Taylor, W. F. Taylor, C. C. Tennant, W. Thompson, A. A. Tobin, H. E. Trower, A. Ward, W. E. Washbourne, A. D. O. Wedderburn, T. M. M. Wilde, T. Williams, F. C. Willis, C. J. S. Wilkinson, H. T. Wing, B. P. Woosnam, F. R. S. Wyllie, and A. K. Wyllie, Esqs.

By Order of the Council,

(Signed) JAS. ANDERSON, Chairman, *pro tem.*
Council Chamber, Lincoln's-inn, April 29.

F.,
cl on
in Cou
opinio
at wh
mond
Michae
ough
in real
place,
not les
either
disclos
and th
a Priv

If s
the ord
and rig
that th
her Ma
Judicia
any o
the law
was fir
quished
judges—
Mr. Be
member
during
amount
their ca
particul
case in
date, L
Knight
in deliv
disente
in which
terbur
Thomso
of Lond
worth, I
Chancel
Archieba
Mr. Ben
Commit
council
cluding
Westbu
guilty o
pillars,
culati
simply a
and, in
1627, ap
affair o
at all, t
the Peti
thus rev
illegal, i
consequ
were seen
were ind
turned o

SU

L
APP

In re Em
McMur
Lords J
Homer v
l—pres

THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE.

"F," writing to the *Times* on the recent order in council which we commented, *ante*, p. 466, says:—The order in Council of the 4th of February last, enjoining secrecy of opinions in the Judicial Committee, was made at a council at which the councillors present were the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, the Duke of Northumberland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and Sir T. M. Biddulph. No doubt, though these were the councillors present, the order is, in reality, the Lord Chancellor's. But the important question arising upon it is whether it be valid; and, in the first place, what is its meaning and effect. It is neither more nor less than this—that no member of the committee shall either on the delivery of a judgment or at any time after disclose "how the particular voices and opinions went," and that to do so is a violation of the duty and the oath of a Privy Councillor.

If such was the law on the 4th of February last, when the order was made, the Queen had, no doubt, full power and right, by proclamation or order in council, to command that the law should be obeyed; but if it was not the law, her Majesty had no more power to make the Order on the Judicial Committee than on the High Court of Justice or any of its divisions; and if, on the other hand, this was the law, then it was the law when the Judicial Committee was first established, and it is clear that the many distinguished persons—prelates, chancellors, and eminent judges—who, in several cases, as in Mr. Gorham's case, Mr. Bennett's case, and others, publicly declared that certain members of the committee dissented from the judgment, including the senior member who delivered the judgment, but announced the dissent, must have violated their duty and their oaths as Privy Councillors in thus disclosing "how the particular voices and opinions went." Thus, in the Gorham case, in which the committee was constituted of Lord Langdale, Lord Campbell, Sir James Parkes, Dr. Lushington, Sir Knight Bruce, and Mr. Pemberton Leigh, Lord Langdale, in delivering judgment, announced that Sir Knight Bruce dissented from it. So, in the case of "Essays and Reviews," in which the committee consisted of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Longley), the Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson), the Lord Chancellor (Lord Westbury), the Bishop of London (Dr. Tait, the present Archbishop), Lord Cranworth, Lord Chelmsford, and Lord Kingsdown, the Lord Chancellor, in delivering judgment, announced that the two Archbishops did not concur in certain parts of it. So, in Mr. Bennett's case, the dissent of certain members of the Committee was announced. And if the recent order in council be legal, then all these distinguished persons, including several Lord Chancellors, Lord Campbell, Lord Westbury, Lord Chelmsford, and Lord Cranworth, were guilty of violating their oaths and their duty as Privy Councillors, as they all concurred in disclosing "how the particular voices and opinions went." Such a conclusion is simply absurd, and shows that the order cannot be legal; and, in truth, it professes to revive an order of Charles I. in 1627, applying to the whole council as a Council of State on affairs of State, and not legally applicable to judicial business at all, the council not having any lawful jurisdiction, as the Peitition of Right declared next year! So that the order thus revived was, as applying to judicial business, simply illegal, if, indeed, applicable at all; and the mischievous consequences of attempting to apply it to a judicial body were seen in the case of ship-money, in which the judges were induced silently to concur in an opinion from which it turned out afterwards some of them dissented.

Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.
COURT OF APPEAL.LIST OF APPEALS FOR EASTER Sittings, 1878.
APPEALS FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION.

For Judgment.

In re Emma Smith, deceased Mathew v Mathew app of Wm McMurray from refusal of V C B (a v Feb 16—present Lords Justices James, Baggallay, and Thesiger)
Homer v Homer app of plt from Mr Justice Fry (a v March 1—present Lords Justices James, Baggallay, and Thesiger)

Elias v Griffith app of defts The Snowden Slate Quarries Co & anr from V C H Elias v Griffith app of deft William Morris Griffith from V C H Elias v Griffith app of defts West Snowden Slate Co lind from V C H (a v April 9—present Lords Justices James, Cotton, and Thesiger)

For Hearing.

1878.

(Remainder.)

Lobley v Talbot app of defts (pt hd April 16—present Lords Justices James, Cotton, and Thesiger—proced May 1) Fry J—Dec 18

Meller v Farlow app of plt M R—June 11 (S O for security) In re Cavendish, deceased Cavendish v Mundy app of plt M R—Oct 26 (S O till May 29)

Jacobs v De Morgan app of defts M R—Nov 2 (S O for security) Hope v Gibbs app of plt V C B—Dec 17 (abated—S O by order)

Robinson v Finlay Ward v Robinson app of defts in 1st act & plt in 2nd act V C B—Dec 20 (S O for production of order)

New Appeals.

1878.

Robinson v Duleep Singh app of deft Fry, J—Jan 8 In re Ewing's Trade Marks app of Registrar of Trade Marks V C H—Jan 19

MacDougall v Copestate app of plt V C H—Jan 19 Hall v Heath app of defts M R—Jan 23

In re Newmarch, decd, Newmarch v Storr app of plts V C H—Jan 24

Yarrow v Knightley app of F S Yarrow & ons V C M—Jan 24

Doucet v Geoghegan app of plt V C M—Feb 2 (not before May 20)

Brooks v Harris app of deft Harris V C M—Feb 5 Povah v Vestry of St Luke, Middlesex app of The Vestry V C M—Feb 7

Johns v James app of defts V C B—Feb 7

Broad v Stableford app of deft V C B—Feb 8

Ortigosa v Brown, James & Co app of defts V C H—Feb 14

Bagnall v Carlton app of deft Naylor V C B—Feb 15

Gilbert v Price app of plts V C H—Feb 19

The Nitro Phosphate, &c, Manure Co v The London and St. Katharine Docks Company app of defts Fry J—Feb 22

Fenton v Wills app of defts Mary J Wills & anr V C B—Feb 26

Amor v Hewitt app of deft M R—Feb 27

Lee v Wills app of plt Fry, J—Feb 28

Leach v Jay app of plt M R—Mar 5

Thomas v Atherton app of plt V C B—Mar 6

Wilson v Rhodes app of defts John Rhodes & anr Fry J—Mar 7

Williams v Williams app of Jane Williams from judgt dated 27th June, 1877 V C H—Mar 8

Williams v Williams app of Jane Williams from order dated 16th June, 1877 V C H—Mar 8

Nixon v Nixon app of deft V C B—Mar 12

Malcolm v Smith app of defts Wetherell & Smart Fry, J—Mar 14

Attree v Hawe app of Corp of Brighton V C H—Mar 19

Richards v The Swansea Improvement & Tramways Co app of defts V C H—Mar 19

Flower v Lloyd app of defts V C B—Mar 20

Tildesley v Harper app of deft Anderson Fry, J—Mar 22

Faithfull v Rewn app of plt M R—Mar 23

Pocock v The Grand Junction Canal Proprietors app of defts V C H—Mar 27

Krebl v Burrell app of deft M R—April 2

Blake v Alfrey app of plt V C M—April 10

Sheffield v Eden app of plt Fry, J—April 10

Attorney-General v The Biphosphate Co app of plt Fry J—April 11

Tippett v Spiegel app of plts Fry, J—April 11

Watson v Rodwell app of deft V C M—April 12

White v White app of J D Carnichael V C B—April 12

In re The Neath & Brecon Ry Co app of J J Williams & ons V C M—April 15

Tunstall v Close app of plts Fry, J—April 15

Leach v Jay app of plts M R—April 15

In re Skinner, deceased, Skinner v Smith app of deft Chas Smith V C B—April 18

Curtis v Wormald app of plt M R—April 18

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Chancery Division.

1878

(S O) In re Foster, W E, & co app of Martin E Dodman V C M—Jan 31

The Dunkirk Colliery Co v Lover app of defts M R—Feb 23

(S O) In re The Tewkesbury Hosiery Co app of Lechinere & Co V C B—April 4

(S O) Coleman v Lloyd app of plt V C H—April 10

Scully v Earl of Dundonald app of plt V C M—April 11
 Fisher v Owen app of plt V C B—April 11
 (S O) In re Aird, deceased, Aird v Quick app of G E Morton
 V C M—April 12
 (S O) Baylis v Dick app of deft Dick V C H—April 12
 (S O) Hussey v Payne app of deft V C M—April 13
 Cramer v National Deposit Bank app of defts V C M—
 April 13
 Addison v Monroe app of plt V C M—April 15
 (S O) In re The British Farmers' Pure Linseed Cake Co, limited,
 app of J W Potter & sons V C H—April 16
 (S O) In re Tussaud, deceased, Tussaud v Tussaud (White's
 claim app of White M R—April 16
 In re The Railway Accident Mutual Assurance Co app of Jno
 Brown M R—April 18
 (S O) In re The Devonshire Silkstone Coal Co, limited, & Co's
 acts app of surviving liquidators V C M—April 20
 (S O) Heneage v Heneage app of plt V C M—April 24
 (S O) In re Thorniley, deceased, Everett v Barker app of Edwin
 Storer V C H—April 25

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

For Judgment.

The Queen v The Principal, &c, of Hertford College, Oxford
 app of deft in error from Justices Mellor and Lush (c a v Dec
 17—present Lord Coleridge and Lords Justices Bramwell,
 Baggallay, and Brett)
 Lohr v Atchison & sons app of deft from order of Justices
 Mellor and Lush on special case (c a v Jan 16—present Lords
 Justices Bramwell, Brett, and Cotton)
 Price v Bannister app of deft from judge at trial without a
 jury before Lord Coleridge (c a v Jan 29—present Lords
 Justices Bramwell, Brett, and Cotton)
 Horne v Rouquette app of deft from judge at trial without a
 jury before Lord Coleridge (c a v Feb 2—present Lords
 Justices Bramwell, Brett, and Cotton)
 The Queen v The Overseers, &c, and Mayor, &c, of the
 Borough of Walsall app of defts from judge of Justices
 Mellor & Lush, affirming order of sessions (c a v Feb 5—
 present L C J of England and Lords Justices Bramwell,
 Brett, and Cotton)

For Hearing.

(Remainders.)

1877.

Campbell v Rothwell (Liverpool D R) app of plt from judge
 at common jury trial before Mr Justice Denman—Jan 4
 (New Appeals.)

1876.

Laing v Holloway & sons app of deft from judge of Justices
 Mellor & Lush on sp c—Jan 11
 Lascelles & sons v The Earl of Onslow & sons app of plt from
 order of Justices Mellor & Lush referring sp case back to
 arbitrator—Jan 15 (S O till Trinity Sittings by consent)
 Goddard v Thompson & sons rule nisi granted Jan 18, returnable
 before Court of Appeal al—Jan 18
 Baxendale v Bennett rule nisi granted Jan 22 returnable
 before Court of Appeal—Jan 24 Baxendale v Bennett app of
 defts from judge at trial without a jury before Mr Justice
 Lopes—Jan 28

The Mayor, &c, of Harwich, & sons v The Great Eastern Ry
 Co app of deft Co from judge of Justices Mellor and Field
 on sp c—Jan 30

Fitzgibbon & sons v Grant & sons Grant & sons v The North
 Wales Narrow Gauge Ry Co (by original action & counter
 claim) app of deft Co from judge at trial without a jury before
 Mr Justice Manisty—Jan 30

Westrip v Wood, administratrix, &c, order nisi granted Feb 6,
 returnable before Court of Appeal—Feb 6

Holme v Brunskill & sons app of plt from judge after common
 jury trial before Mr Justice Denman—Feb 8

Levy v Lawes app of deft from judge of L C J of England &
 Mr Justice Manisty on sp c—Feb 27

Newson & sons v Pemberton app of deft from L C J of Eng-
 land and Mr Justice Mellor—Feb 28

Wingate, Birrell & sons v Foster app of plt from judge after
 special jury trial before Mr Justice Field—March 1

Liverpool District Registry, McMillan & sons v The Liverpool
 & Texas Steam Ship Co, limited & sons app of plt from judge
 after jury trial before Mr Justice Denman—March 1

Potterton v Watney app of deft from judge after special jury
 trial before Mr Justice Lush—March 19

Angus & sons v Dalton app of plt from judge of L C J of Eng-
 land & Justice Mellor and Lush on special referee's report—
 March 22

Pickup v The Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co limited
 app of defts from order of L C J of England & Mr Justice
 Mellor for new trial—March 23

Cooper, trustee, &c, v Neil app of plt from judge after special
 jury trial before Mr Justice Lindley and from subsequent
 order of L C J of England and Mr Justice Manisty—April 1

Fellowes v Jeffery & sons, trading, &c, app of deft from judge
 after common jury trial before Mr Justice Lindley—April 6

Burdick & sons v Lordan app of plt from judge after jury trial
 before Mr Justice Lopes—April 12
 Boyce v Duns, Brown & sons app of plt from judge without a
 jury of Mr Justice Hawkins—April 18

FROM THE COMMON PLEAS DIVISION.

For Hearing.

(Remainders.)

1877.

(S O) Mayer, &c, of London v London Joint Stock Bank
 app of deft from Lord Coleridge (26 Jan, 1876 S O till
 issues of fact tried)

(S O) Grant & sons v The Banque Franco Egyptienne and the
 Mayor, &c, of London app of the Banque from judge on de-
 murrers 19th Jan. 1876 (S O to come on with appeal of J S
 Bank)

(S O) Kanitz v Scarborough & sons app of plt from judge of
 Justices Brett & Grove on Feb 18, 1876—Feb 18 (S O till
 security for costs given)

(S O) Redrup and sons v King app of deft from judge at trial
 before Mr. Justice Denman (S O till security given) July 20
 Yotts & sons v Foster app of deft from judge at trial before
 Lord Justice Brett—Nov 8

(New Appeals.)

1878.

Usill v Brearley app of plt from new trial rule discharged by
 Lord Coleridge and Mr Justice Lopes Usill v Clarke app
 of plt from new trial rule discharged by Lord Coleridge and
 Mr Justice Lopes Usill v Hales app of plt from new
 trial rule discharged by Lord Coleridge and Mr Justice Lopes
 Feb 11 (S O till security given)

Anderson & sons v Pellicier rule nisi granted Feb 6, returnable
 before Court of Appeal—Feb 13

Stoneham v Davies, wife & sons app of defts from judge at trial
 before Mr Justice Denman—Mar 2

Ford v Taylor app of deft from discharge of new trial rule by
 Justices Grove & Lindley—Mar 11 (S O till security given)

Moss v James app of plt from judge after trial before Mr Justice
 Denman—Mar 13

Taylor & sons v Shales app of plt from rule absolute for new
 trial granted by Justices Denman & Lindley—Mar 14

Watson v Houltier & wife app of plt from judge at trial with-
 out jury before Mr Baron Pollock—Mar 16

Charles v Taylor, Walker & sons app of plt from judge after
 trial before Mr Justice Lopes—Mar 16

Kaltebach v Mackenzie app of deft from rule absolute for
 new trial granted by Justices Grove, Denman & Lopes—Mar
 19

Hales v Quennell app of deft from judge after trial before Mr
 Justice Lush—Mar 20 (S O till security given)

Kendall & sons v Hamilton app of deft from judge after trial
 without a jury by Mr Baron Huddleston—Mar 26

Ottaway v Hamilton app of deft from judge after trial before
 Mr Justice Denman—Mar 26

Kipling, Reg P O v Todd app of deft from judge after trial
 without a jury by Mr Justice Lopes—April 5

Kipling, Reg P O v Allan app of deft from judge after trial
 without a jury by Mr Justice Lopes—April 5

FROM THE EXCHEQUER DIVISION.

For Judgment.

H M Attorney-General v The Mayor, &c, of Portsmouth
 app of the Attorney-General from judge on sp case of Barons
 Cleasby & Pollock on revenue side of Exch Div (c a v—
 present Lords Justices Bramwell, Brett, and Cotton)

Weir v Barnett & sons (against deft Bell) app of plt from
 L C Baron & Barons Pollock & Huddleston (c a v March 2
 —present L C J of England and Lords Justices Bramwell,
 Brett, and Cotton)

Beynon & sons v Godden & sons (H R Evans, 3rd party) app of
 plt and cross app of defts from judge at trial before Mr
 Baron Huddleston (c a v March 5—present Lords Justices
 Bramwell, Brett, and Cotton)

For Hearing.

(Remainders.)

1877.

McDougall & sons v Millwall Dock Co app of plt from L C
 Baron & Barons Cleasby & Pollock on sp c (pt hd March 6—
 present Lords Justices Bramwell, Cotton, and Thesiger)

Hutchinson v Rogers app of deft from L C Baron & Mr
 Baron Pollock—Dec 21

Acatos v Burns & sons app of plt and cross-app of deft from
 judge at trial before Mr Baron Huddleston—Dec 28

(New Appeals.)

1878.

Davies & sons v Felix & sons app of defts from judge at trial
 before Lord Justice Bramwell—Jan 8

Bunting v Sargent & sons app of plt from judge at trial before
 Mr Justice Denman—Jan 9

The Wrexham, Mold & Connahs Quay Ry Co v The Little
 Mountain Coal, Iron & Clay Co limited app of defts from judge

In re T
 (Com
 app o
 proba
 Ship O
 Own
 Phillip
 Ship A
 Util
 of Sir
 Ship Pe
 the
 of def
 session
 Ship Fel
 Owners
 judge
 Mar 2

In re Ch
 In re Wa
 In re Gi
 In re Po
 In re She
 In re Do
 In re Lan

N.B.—T

at trial before Mr Justice Denman (S O till security given)—
Jan 16

Bandal, Saunders & Co limd v Thorn & Co app of defts from
judge at trial before Mr Baron Huddleston—Jan 18

Stevenson v Taylor app of debt from judge at trial before Mr
Justice Lopes—Jan 29

The Mayor, &c, of Pethyn v Best app of defts from judge of
Baron Cleasby & Mr Justice Hawkins—Feb 12

Fisher v Drewitt app of debt from L C Baron and Mr Baron
Pollock—Feb 23

Smith & Son v McDougall app of debt from L C Baron and
Mr Baron Pollock—Feb 23

Etty v Wilson app of plt from judge at trial before Mr Justice
Denman—Feb 26

Rickard v Moore app of plt from judge at trial before Mr
Justice Hawkins—Feb 27

Shaddick v The Crown Preserved Coal Co, limd app of plt
from L C Baron and Mr Baron Cleasby—Mar 1

Fairclough v Marshall app of plt from judge at trial before
Mr Justice Manisty—Mar 8

Straker & ors v Kidd & Co app of defts from judge at trial
before Mr Justice Lush (S O by order till appeal heard in
another action)—Mar 27

Cochrane v Matthews app of defts from judge at trial before
Mr Justice Lindley—Mar 28

Moyerhoff & anr v Froehlich app of plt from judge at trial
before Mr Justice Denman—April 24

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Common
Law Divisions.
1877.

(S O) Beach, trading, &c v Moss & Martin (Exch Div) app of
deft Moss from L C J of England and Mr Justice Mellor
(S O for security)—Nov 23

(S O) Beach, trading, &c v Green & Moss (Exch Div) app of
deft Moss from L C J of England and Mr Justice Mellor
(S O for security)—Nov 23

1878.

Browne v The Banbury, &c, Ry Co (Exch Div) app of deft Co
from L C Baron and Mr Justice Hawkins—Mar 4

Sturge & ors v Garlick (Q B Div) app of debt from order of
L C J of England and Mr Justice Mellor on demr—Mar 8

Bryant & anr v Herbert C P Div) app of plt from Justices
Denman & Lindley refusing motion for taxation and payment
of plt costs—Mar 12

Hickey v Montifore (Exch Div) app of defts from Lord Coleridge
and Mr Justice Lindley—April 4

Robert Percy Atttenborough—1878—A—75 v The London & St
Katharine Docks Co (Q B Div) app of defts from order of Lord
Coleridge and Mr Baron Huddleston—April 12

Robert Atttenborough—1878—A—107 v The London & St
Katharine Docks Co (Exch Div) app of defts from order of Lord
Coleridge and Mr Baron Huddleston—April 13

Kendall & ors v Hamilton (C P Div) app of debt from Justices
Lindley & Lopes—April 25

FROM THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION.

For Hearing.

(New Appeals.)

(Probate.)

1878.

In re The Goods of Lady Hannah C Tharp, deceased Tharp
(Committee of Estate of Jno Tharp a Lunatic) v McDonald
app of plt from judge of Sir R J Phillimore granting limit
probate of Lady Tharp's Will—Feb 7

Ship Ocean—1877—G 422 General Steam Navigation Co v The
Owners of the Ocean app of plt from Judge of Sir R J
Phillimore (with Nautical Assessors)—Feb 15

Ship America—1877—O 390 The Owners of the Cargo of the
Title v The Owners of the America app of depts from judge of
Sir R J Phillimore (with Nautical Assessors)—Mar 1

Ship Pennsylvania—1877—O 630 (Liverpool P R) The Owners
of the Oasis & ors v The Owners of the Pennsylvania app
of defts from judge of Sir R J Phillimore (with Nautical As-
sessors)—Mar 19.

Ship Fulton Bent—1878—O 1 The Owners of the Stray v The
Owners of the Fulton Bent and Freight app of debt from
judge of Sir R J Phillimore (with Nautical Assessors)—
Mar 22

FROM THE LONDON COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

In re Charlton Ex parte Monkhouse

In re Ware Ex parte Carter

In re Gibson Ex parte Chambers

In re Pollard Ex parte Dickin

In re Shernell Ex parte Snow

In re Dodds Ex parte Singleton

In re Lamb Ex parte Lamb

N.B.—The above list contains Appeals set down to Friday,
April 26, inclusive.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—CHANCERY DIVISION.

LIST OF CAUSES FOR EASTER Sittings, 1878.

Before the MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).

Blair v Hoskin act Abadam v Abadam act
Beldam v The Ely, &c, Ry Co Jackson v Hankey act
act Bodlemann v Anglo Australian
Russel v The Wakefield Water- Bank act
works Co o (not before May
16)

Harrison v Wearing act The Companhia Telegraphica,
Kuhr v Daughish act & v Grant act
Appleton v Mayor, &c, of Joaling v Langford act
Bolton act The Corporation of London v
Chilton act Watson v Spensley act
Watson v Hobson act Wainwright v Nicholay act
Shettle v Rawlins act & adjd sums (cross-examination on
affidavite)

Sheffield Banking Co v Fowler act

Mirhouse v Barnett act Gray v Lucas act

Arnes v Saville act Holford v Monolithic, &c, Co
limd act

Simmons v Storer act McArthur v Sweeting act

In re Bangle, decd Bangle v Hayes act

Causes for trial (without witnesses).

Harper v Thwaites demr to Crapper v Rotherham Skating
statement of claim Rink Co act

In re Parkinson, decd Parkinson Broadbent v Holloway act

act Fawdry v Fawdry spc c

Nelson v Dahl act

Pearse v Harvey m for judgt Arnott v Heygate spc c

Grüttner v Du Plan f c Leonini v Leonini spc c

Meldola v Portbury f c The National Bolivian, &c,
Young v Young f c Co v Lloyd act and m in
Meachim v Cooper f c Wilson v Church (May 1 by
In re James, decd James v Thompson order)

Mason v Robinson act Hoar v Seagar act

Hepplewhite v Baker f c Davey v Thorner act

Jones v Griffiths f c Topper v Matthews m for
order judgt

Elliman v Elliman act (not before May 6)

In re Williams, decd act

Williams v Williams act

Stelfox v Baker act and m for
judgt

Jones v Griffiths c Bramley v Francis act

Causes for trial standing over.

Chapman v Green c wits Elmslie v Jelley a wits (S O
Glamis v Smith act (jury to amend)

trial) Berlin Phosphate Co v Hart-
mont act and m for judgt

(S O generally by order)

Turner v Malcolm act wits Phillips v Davidson act (evid-
(S O by consent) ence not complete)

Hartopp v De Morgan act with
wits (jury trial)

In re Fothergill, deceased Burroughes v Sexton act with
Fothergill v Fothergill act wits (S O for evidence by
(evidence not complete) order)

Murray v Trollope act (evid-
ence not complete)

Stoor v Coles act wits (S O
Trinity Sittings)

Stronach v Burroughes act (S O by order)

Woddy v Roberts act wits

(S O by consent)

Reid v The Buxton Cement Co act wits (S O for compromise)

c (S O by order) Hengh v Chamberlain act wits
(S O for affidavit of documents)

In re Ingram, decd. Brown v Wright m for judgt (S O

generally by order)

Corptn of Batley v Barnshaw act (S O by order)

Rashleigh v Daisell e (S O by order)

Bray v Reddick a wits (S O
by order)

Furneaux v Pettigrew act

(evidence not complete)

Bettini v Bettini a (S O generally by const)
Dinnis v Dinnis act (evidence not complete) Lovejoy v Carry a (S O generally by order)
Waddell v Blockey act (jury trial)

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir RICHARD MALINS.
Causes for trial.

Powell v Tewsbury	demr	Twinberrow v Braid	act, wits
Wright v Barnett	c	Charlton v Swain	act
Tussell v Elliston	act	Shoff v Albion Life Assurance	
Hargreaves v Lewis	c wits	Society	act, wits
Norton v L and N W Ry Co	act	Harrison v Harrison	f c
Duke of Rutland v Tutin and		Boville v Cooper	m for judgt
Co	act & demr	Lawrence v Lawrence	f c & 2 sums
Northampton Coal Co v Mid-		Fraser v Smith	act, wits
land Wagon Co	act	Holling v Campbell	act, wits
Lee Conservancy Board v		Crosaley v Dornig	f c
Button	act	Chapman v Loftus	f c
In re Ovey	Ovey v Ovey	Ruddock v Ruddock	f c
Kenny v Hollings	act	School Board of London v Fal-	
Amen v Cadogan	act	coner	act
Jenney v Bell	act	Earl of Sandwich	Great Nor-
In re Aston, decd Hughes v		thern Ry cause, wits	
Aston act Nottingham D R		Lamminian v Walker	act, wits
Foley v Vizard	act	Guille v Fox	In re Fox Leo-
In re Sugden, decd Sugden v		nard v Guille	f c
Sugden act against debt Wm		Coley v Coley	f c
Sugden, & m judge against			

deft Hy Sudgen
Rudall v Nichols f c
Taunton v Morris f c & pet
Gilbert v Smith f c
Lord v Greenwood f c
In re Cooper, decd Cooper v
Cooper f c
In re Dunnell, decd Kinsey v
Webber f c
In re Fountain decd Stevens v
Fountain f c & sums to vary
Saunders v Hooper Hooper v
Hooper f c
Dale v HM Attorney Gen f c
Felton v Bartlam f c
Eland v Clarke f cons
Adams v Coe act
Garner v Moore Garner v
Moore Garner v Harwood
Walker v Harwood f c &
pet by order
Barber v Batchelor act
Milne v Taylor sp c
Bridges v Strachan f c
Pearl v Strachan f c
In re Turner, decd Turner v
Turner f c

In re Castro decd de Castro v
Pelly f c
Mayhew v Cattermole f c
Bensted v Hall act
Earl of Radnor v Graham
cause, wits
Williams v Hughes f c
In re Robson, decd Emly v
Davidson act, m for judge
In re Brown decd Lawley v
Dixon act
British Mining, &c, Co v Tay-
lor act, wits
Dawes v Bagden act
Alderson v Woods act
In re Kingdom, decd Martin v
Cowland m for judge
In re Chisum, decd Battersby v
Chisum act, wits
Collier v Selig act, wits
In re Shearley, decd Sanders v
Shearley act
Davies v Brecon, &c, Ry act
Margeson v Goodland
wits
Harris v Harford f c
Hensler v Myers act

Turner v Co
 Weldon v Dicks act
 Pearce v Pierce f c (short)
 Wellington v Taddy f c &
 sums to vary
 Petrie v Oddy f c
 Walker v Blake f c
 Wormwell v Wormwell f c
 Reed v The Madeira & Mamore
 By Co, lind
 Norton v Child act
 In re James Gosman f c pte n
 of right & sums to vary
 In re Fullerton, deced Smith
 v Fullerton f c
 De Bolia v Teape act
 Pudge v Pudge f c
 Brockwell v Fox f c
 Smith v Smith special case
 In re Addison Jacobs v Addi-
 sen f c & sums to vary
 Norman v Templeton act
 Armitage v Marshall f c
 Thorley's Food for Cattle v
 Massen act
 Kusel v Wstaen m for judgt
 Austin v Hall act, witness
 In re Forbes, deced Maxwell v
 Whitaker f c & sums to
 vary
 Farrar v Green f c & sums to
 vary
 Wilson v de Coulon act
 Taylor v Guppy act (jury
 trial)
 Taylor v Guppy m for judgt
 Meredith v Hampden f c

Hengler v Myers act
 In re Worrall, deced Gurney
 v Clare f c
 Chaplin v Ashton f c
 Randall v Prosser act
 Mills v Jennings act
 Brooke v Wigg act (jury trial)
 Clarke v Budgett m for judgt
 Hales v Clarke fur con
 In re Johnson, deced Harrison
 v Dearlove act
 Lord Lovat v Leslie sp trial
 In re Johnson, deced Johnson
 v Leigh act (short)
 In re Beaumont deced Wilkin-
 son v Walker act
 Cope v Few act
 Hensby v Justice act
 In re Rohrs, deced Rohrs v
 Rodwell act and m for judgt
 Boyes v Cook f c
 Turney v Hancock m for judgt
 In re Palmer, deced Binning
 v Binning f c
 In re W Palmer, deced Palmer
 v Cooper m for judgt
 Heesketh v Bolton Guards act
 In re Hale, deced Western v
 King f c
 Bryan v Moss fur con and
 summs to vary
 Collins v Bishop f c
 In re Waites, deced Barratt v
 Scholey m for judgt (short)
 Carter v Burney act with
 Smith v Bennett f c
 Schwaben v Quick act

Causes standing over.	
Murray v Crichton	f o (S O)
Dunning v Berridge	c (S O)
Back v Hay, Bart	c (S O)
Harris v Harris	m judgt (S O)
In re Eaton, deceased	Eaton
v Eaton	m judt (S O)
Sadler v Whalley	(S O)
Smith v Chadwick	act (S O)

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir JAMES BACON.
Causes for trial.

Pulbrook v New Civil Service Co-operation	lind demr of defts	New Supply Assoc	In re Ward, deceased	Benn-
Same v Same	demr of defts	New Civil Service Co-operation	Balls	ment w
The Nanty-Glo and Blaina Iron Works Company	lind v Carlton	c wits	Rolls v Isaacs	act w
Original Hartlepool Collieries Co v Moon	c wits	Hepa v Gibbs	act	
Moon v Original Hartlepool Collieries Co	c wits	The Aberber Colliery, lind v Pen y Van Colliery Co	act	
Bradbury v Lamb	c wits	Attorney-Gen v Furness Ry Co	act	
Jones v Evans	act	(April 30)		
Chester v Gregg	act	Bell v Thompson	act	
In re Smith	Tellaw v Smith	Levy v Joseph	m for judgt	
act with wits		Kelsey v Ellis	f con	
Comfort v Brown	sp c	In re Wallace, deceased	Wal-	
		lace v Wallace	lace act and m for	
		judgt		
		Green v Green	f con	
		In re Toms, deceased	Bags-	
		v Gunn	ton f con	
		Hagg v Darley	act	

Causes Standing Over

De Reuter v Gillespie act (S O)	In re Jones Jones v Jones act (not to be in the paper before and act not set down)
Crosbie v Perkes c (S O)	Basham v Hutchinson c (S O)
Berlin, &c, Co v Phosphate Sewage Co c (S O)	Hutchinson v Basham c (S O)
Harris v The West London Imperial Building Society act (S O)	In re Latimer Atkinson v Latimer act (abated)
Harrison v Sharp in judt (S O)	Tolpuft v Kilburn c wits (S O)
North Cheshire, &c, Co v Husband c (S O G)	Wright v Wright c wits (S O)
	Byron v Deacon c wits (abated)
	Thorpe v Snowden act (S O G)
	Whitelaw v Pearce act wits

(S.O)

Jones v Jones demr
Surtees v Malet c wits (not
before June)
Preston v Etherington act
(May 6)
In re Hall Cadle v Gough
act wits
Bridges v Bridges act wits (not
before May 20)

before May 20)
Fullick v Robertson act with
Fullick v Fullick act with
wits
In re Hughes Roberts v.
Roberts m judgt (not before
May 16)
In re Williams Gough v.
Williams act
Kipping v Keogh act
Esdale v Viser act
Francis v Reese act
Binney v Lincoln act
Holt v Coates m for judgt
Walker v Garbutt act with
wits
Reynolds v Bullock act (not
before May 7)
In re Webb, deed Webb v.
Webb act (not before May
7)
Complin v Hudson act with

wits
In re Middleton, deed Drake v.
Pratt act with wits
Clydesdale Banking Co of
Glasgow v Johnson act (not
before May 13)
Adams v Cheesman act
Burkinshaw v Union Bank of
Hull act (not before May
2)
In re Walton, deed Sharp v.
Hall act with wits
Brown v Henty act with wits
Fape v Hillier act
Dury v Seed act with wits

Jarvis v Sprott f c (Liver-
pool D R)
Ball v Thomas act with wife
(May 1)
Smith v Sebright act with
wife
In re Clarke, deed Spencer v
Clarke act with wife
Bazington v Whennell act

Engelhardt v Engelhardt
Robinson v South and Easter
Coast Ry Co act with wife
(May 1)
In re Oliver, decd Oliver v
Oliver m for judgt
Wingfield v Wingfield m for
judgt
Lewis v Nobbs act and m for
judgt
Strangways v Warry act with
wife
Murell v Murell act with
wife
Mendelsohn v Rittenberg m
for judgt
Morton v Jenkins act
Kendrew v Punch act with
wife
Horn v Horn fur con
Phillips v Willats act after
m by order (April 30)
In re Bale, decd Lofty v Bale
fur con
In re Dearing, decd Girling
v Girling act with wife
Turner v Rockhill act
Richmond v Tarleton m for
judgt
Ancona v Waddell fur con (not
before May 17)
Best v Hammond act with
wife
Day v Kirk act
Engelhardt v Engelhardt sp c
Robinson v Brett act

In re Hobson, decd Foster v Hobson act and m for judgt Hammond v Hughes act with wits
Shelton v Shelton act with wits
Jepson v Tideswell m for judge
Atkinson v Birks act
In re Rogers, decd Rogers v Glastonbury for con
In re Brodgen, decd Budgett v Brodgen act
Marden v Kent for con
Innes v Marsden for con
Royal Bank of Scotland v Tongue act and m for judge with wits (not before May 13)
Holyoake v Loch act
In re Vincent, decd Trestrall v James f.c.
In re Philpot, decd Philpot v Watson f.c.

Causes Standing Over.

Republic of Peru v Ruzo m for decree (not before July 18)
Prothero v Fox c (pending sum)
Hunt v City of London act (jury trial)
Taylor v Cranwell c (S O)
Dowdeswell v Dowdeswell act wits (S O Nov. 1878)
Parsons v Harris act (S O)
In re Wintle, deceased, Wintle v Wintle m for judge (evidence not complete)
Fox v Forster act (S O for evidence)
Holt v Holt act (jury trial)
In re Da Costa, deceased, Da Costa v Da Costa m for judge, pt hd (S O)
Bowly v Edmonds act (not before July 1)
Jones v Prothero act (S O)
Spencer v Hopkins & Co act (S O G)

Naah v Billingham act (S O)
Bedford v Isaacs act (S O)
Millard v Bertill act and m for judgt (S O)
De Windt v Johnson f.c and p (S O)
Thomas v Hastelow act (S O)
Lawrie v Lees act (S O)
Mayor, &c, of Portsmouth v Foster (S O G)
Paris v Oleaga c (S O)
Smith v United Co-operative Coal, &c, Society act (S O G)
Coleman v Lloyd f.c (S O)
Rutley v Doherty act (evidence not complete)
Craven Banking Co v Smith m for judge (S O G)
Clements v Norris act (jury trial)
Rogers v Huntback act (jury trial)
Yeldham v Yeldham act, wits (sums pending)

Before Mr. Justice FRY.

Causes for Trial.

Dawson v Dawson c (S O—) Hunt v The Glamorgan Coal Co, lind act (S O—MR)
Platt v Kershaw act (S O—) Pearson v Scott act wits MR V C H
Litton v Litton act (S O) V C H

Transferred from Vice-Chancellor MALINS, by Order of 27th July, 1877.

In re Blakeway Simcox v Blakeway act (S O)
Berridge v Gunn o with wits In re Rawston Pickup v Rawston act
In re Garland Garland v Beverley act (S O)
Gardner v Woodhouse act with wits (S O G)
Dyer v Stamp act with wits (April 30)
Ashley v Taylor act with wits (S O)

Phillips v Bolton act
Steuart v Gladstone c Bell v Lawrence act wits (S O G)
In re Pratt Miles v Price act with wits (S O)
Stuart v Trewella act

Transferred from Vice-Chancellor MALINS and Vice-Chancellor HALL, by Order of the 19th November, 1877.

Mattinson v Tickell act wits V C M
Gibbs v Somerset, &c Ry act (S O) V C H
Nicholas Nicholas act V C M
Rees v Wigram act V C H
Morris v Somerset, &c, Ry Co act wits (S O) V C H
Broomfield v Matthews act (S O) V C M
England v Kelly act V C H
Ewing & Co v Johnston & Co act wits (S O) V C H

Biller v Power Power v Biller act wits V C M
Bradley v Riches act and m judgt V C H
In re Turner, deceased Turner v Turner m judge (S O) V C M
St Clair v Trower act and m judgt V C H
Cranknall v Janson act & m judgt V C H
Bolt v Coulson act V C M
Nicholas v Nicholas act V C M

Transferred from Vice-Chancellor MALINS, by Order of 21st February, 1878.

Glenecross v Glenecross act Oliver v Oliver m judge (S O G)
Associated Home Co v Whic-hord act with wits Loog v Charrageat act Cavey v Grubb act
In re Bell, decd Bath v Bell act with wits Marrell v Wainwright m for judgt Ash v Elwell c Maxon v Everett c Parker v Burne act (S O)
Swift v Balshaw act with wits (S O G)

Transferred from Vice-Chancellor BACON, by order of 8th April, 1878.

March v Farrant c Weardale Iron, &c, Co v Tuke act with wits Dodds v Tuke act with wits Williams v Phelps m for judge In re Openshaw, decd Duckworth v Openshaw act and m for judge

Lupton v Whyte act with wits The above list contains causes set down to Friday, April 26, inclusive.

MIDDLESEX.

EASTER SITTING, 1878.

This list contains all actions entered in Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions, in which notice of trial has been given; and also all actions in the Chancery Division, in which notice has been given of trial before a judge and jury, up to and including 1st May, 1878.

ADDITIONAL LIST OF ACTIONS FOR TRIAL.

Ex 1 Hall (In Person) v Gill (Rickards & W)
Ex 2 Beeton (Milward & W) v Mason (Mead & D)
C P 3 West (Meynell & P) v De la Warr (Cope & Co) SJ
Q B 4 Woolf (R & E Bastard) v Harris & Co (A Pulbrook)
C P 5 Eyre (G L P Eyre & Co) v Moffatt & anr (J G Watson) SJ
Ex 6 Ball (Duncan, M W & G) v Moore (Crowdy & Son)
C P 7 Torres (Tilleard, G & H) v Cordner (Foss & L)
Ex 8 Hickey (Belfrage & M) v Montefiore (Lewis & Lewis)
Q B 9 Creed (A J Murray) v Millatt (Roscoe, H & S)
Ex 10 Kendrick (G J & P Vanderpump) v Scarth (Torr & Co)
Ex 11 Bright & ors (Hargrove & Co) v The Telegraph Construction, &c, Co (Bircham & Co) SJ
Ex 12 Berridge (Willoughby & Cox) v Roberts (Harris & Godwin) SJ
Q B 13 Brown (Merriam, M & Co) v Elkington & ors (Lunley & L)
Ex 14 Ancrum (T Durant) v Grover (H H Mason & Son)
Ex 15 Grover (H H Mason & Son) v Ancrum (T Durant)
Q B 16 Whitaker (J Frost) v Breffit (W Maynard)
Ex 17 Swaine (Denton, H & B) v Reynolds (Milne, B & M) SJ
C P 18 Gledhill (Harper, B & B) v Brown & ors (Janson, C & P) SJ
Ex 19 Upton (R H Wilkins) v Heaven (J H Jones) SJ
C P 20 Covell (W Philp) v Sykes (Dunn & P)
C P 21 Griffiths (M G Georghegan) v London & St Katharine Docks Co (Humphreys & Son) SJ
Ex 22 Bishop & anr (A D Smith) v Bluck (Pownall & Co)
C P 23 Wilbraham (Chapman, T & B) v The Maritime Passengers & Mariners Insurance Co, lind (Harrison & Son)
Q B 24 Wood (C B Clayton) v A Robson (Thompson, L & C) SJ
Q B 25 Same (Same) v J W Robson (Same) SJ
Q B 26 Mayor, &c, of London (T J Nelson) v Low & anr (W S Gardener; M Hawkins) SJ
Ex 27 Tolme (J B Batten) v Whitby, Redcar & Middlesbrough Union Ry Co (Tilleard & Co)
Ex 28 Steenackers (Goldring & J) v Yglesiass (Randall & A)
Q B 29 D'Oyley (Markby & Co) v Heynemann & anr (Johnson & Co; Elmslie & Co) SJ
Q B 30 Cameron (Shum & Co) v Gowland (Harcourt & M) SJ
Q B 31 Asp, Berger & Co (Combe & W) v Lefevre & Co (W G Colley)
Ex 32 Morton (O B Wooller) v Maxwell (J J Keily) SJ
Ex 33 Maxwell (J J Keily) v Morton (O B Wooller) SJ
Q B 34 Sawbridge & anr (N Bennett) v Eggar (Walker & Co)

- C P 35 Woodrow (J Robinson) v The Albion Life Assurance Society (J C Campbell)
- Q B 36 Provand (Lindo & Co) v Langton & anr (J E Fox & Co)
- Q B 37 Powis (Combe & W) v Tench (Pownall, Son, C & K)
- Chy 38 Dressel (W Elsey) v The Rhenish Westphalian Lloyd (Druck & Co)
- C P 39 Ludbrook (G E Carpenter) v Barrett (Wontner & Sons)
- Q B 40 Benjamin (J Frost) v Litten (F A Lewty)
- Ex 41 The Corticine Floor Covering Co (Pattison, W & C) v Ridley, Son & Whitley (Mills & L) SJ
- Ex 42 Same (Same) v Tull, Glavill & Co, and Treloar & Son (Bower & C; Hyde & T) SJ
- C P 43 Naylor (Walters, Young & Co) v Tabor & anr (F L Soames)
- Ex 44 Cowell & anr (E Woodard) v Barker & anr (Hollams, Son & C) SJ
- C P 45 Müller (W W Young) v Clever (W Arnold)
- Q B 46 The Commissioners of the Admiralty (Hare & F) v Dowthwaite (Maples & Co) SJ
- C P 47 Brown (C M Elbrough) v London & Yorkshire Bank (Bischoff, B & B) SJ
- Ex 48 Cox (H Reid) v Coote (Jones, T & G)
- Q B 49 Sir B Hills & ors (Bischoff, B & B) v The Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District (Few & Co) SJ
- C P 50 Davenport (Campbell, R & H) v Rowley (C Armstrong)
- C P 51 Malcolm (Campbell, R & H) v North Eastern Ry Co (Williamson, H & Co) SJ
- Q B 52 Milne (G Brown) v Holmes (L Pass) SJ
- Q B 53 Milne (G Brown) v Holmes & ors (L Pass, J E Brown, & G J & P Vanderpump)
- C P 54 Cabero (W F Nokes) v Mapleson (J & R Gole)
- Ex 55 Howard (Routh & S) v Bookey & Co (R G Marsden)
- C P 56 Hoare (Bircham & Co) v Reeves (Monckton, L & Co) SJ
- Q B 57 Cooper (G Thompson) v Cleverley (W Maynard)
- C P 58 Scott (Sorrell & Son) v Phyesey (S H Head) SJ
- Q B 59 Benjamin (M Abrahams & R) v Higginbottom (F T Dubois) SJ
- C P 60 Webb (Noon & C) v Williamson (W Beck)
- Q B 61 Mell (F Cliff) v Barnes & anr (G L P Eyre & Co) SJ
- C P 62 Plant & anr (J L Mathews) v De Mattos (Elmslie, F & S)
- Q B 63 Solomon (W F Morris) v Stanislaus (E B Tattershall)
- C P 64 Michael (Wilkins & H) v The East & West India Dock Co (Freightfields & W) SJ
- Ex 65 Johnson & anr (Druc, Sons & J) v Mayhew (S Mayhew)
- Q B 66 Dalton (Noon & C) v Mason (F W Adams)
- C P 67 Brockbank & Co (Kiesch, Son & H) v King's Lynn Steam Shipping Co (Flax & L) SJ
- C P 68 Ives (H W Christmas) v McNeill (Barker)
- Q B 69 Hallward (C B Hallward) v Blandford & ors (James Curtis & Co; G H K Fisher)
- Q B 70 German Bank of London, lind (Bircham & Co) v Carwell (H W Lindus)
- C P 71 Dunn (W Hicks) v Bush (In Person)
- Q B 72 The London Financial Association, lind (Markby, T & S) v France (Desne & T) SJ
- Ex 73 Jones (M Rodwell) v Fulde (Brettell, S & B) SJ
- Q B 74 Baxter (Brighton & P) v Ryton (Prior, B C & A)
- Ex 75 Leaman (Harris & G) v Holmwood (Waltons, B & W) SJ
- Q B 76 Joshua (A E Webb) v Green (Hare & F)
- C P 77 Scully (Bircham & Co) v Earl Dundonald (Newman, S & Co) SJ
- C P 78 Cooper (W Maynard) v Roberts (Miller & S)
- Q B 79 Martin & anr (Noon & C) v Smith (Bicknell & H)
- Q B 80 Garrett & ors (Robins & P) v Hammond & anr (Hogan & H)
- Ex 81 Pritchard (G J & P Vanderpump) v London & St Katharine Docks Co (W M Hanson) SJ
- Ex 82 Palmer (Lake, B & Co) v Hope & anr (Shoubridge & M)
- Ex 83 Same (Same) v Bevan (Same)
- Ex 84 Llywdarsh Iron, &c, Co (Houghton & B) v Fearn (A S H Jones)
- C P 85 Key (G B Dodd, jun) v Quartly (A F Barnard)
- C P 86 Le Touzel (J Pallen) v Roy & anr (Roy & C) SJ
- Ex 87 Highton & anr (J C Button & Co) v Treherne & anr (In Person)
- Ex 88 Mailandin (V Musgrave) v Balfour & ors (Tinder & Co; Gregory & Co) SJ
- Ex 89 Besley (Same) v New Zealand Shipping Co, lind (Hollams, Son & C)
- Ex 90 Gonzalez Byass & Co (Tamplin, T & J) v Mackenzie (S Toppin)
- Chy 91 Trustees of Webb, a bankrupt (A Fulbrook) v Clark (White & Sons)
- Q B 92 Hallett (In Person) v Hallett (Duncan, M & Co)
- Q B 93 Marks & anr (Abraham & R) v Weininger (Chapman & Co) SJ
- C P 94 Raintoul (J Knight) v Heynemann (Johnson, U & Co)
- C P 95 Trewick (T Sampson) v Richardson (Watson, Sons & R) SJ
- C P 96 Frearson (C H Edmunds) v Loe (H Kimber & Co)
- Q B 97 Wood (H T Roberts) v Mapleson (J & R Gole) SJ
- C P 98 Licensed Victuallers', &c, Insurance Co (R Helmsham) v Quinlan (Lewis, M & L) SJ
- C P 99 Allpress (G C Lee) v Coulter (G J Jennings)
- Q B 100 Mayer (A Dittom) v Robinson (P W Mazer)
- C P 101 Day (T K Edwards & Son) v Dalzel (C Mallam)
- C P 102 Findlay (S Price) v Leighton (In Person) SJ
- Ex 103 Johnson (T R Apps) v Norman (In Person) SJ
- Ex 104 Spurgin (Beaumont & W) v South Eastern Ry Co (W R Stevens) SJ
- Q B 105 Cumbers (W A Day) v London & North-Western Ry Co (R F Roberts) SJ
- Ex 106 Withers & anr (Whyte, C & P) v Bond (Tilley & S)
- Ex 107 Marshall (E H Clarke) v London & North-Western Ry Co (R F Roberts) SJ
- C P 108 Beal (Beal & de Soyres) v Pilling & anr (Chester & Co) SJ
- Q B 109 Abby (Biroh, J & H) v Cornelius (L W Gregory) SJ
- C P 110 Loe (H Kimber & Co) v Frearson (C H Edmunds)
- Ex 111 Verrall (Palmer, B & F) v Pemberton & ors (Woodbridge & Sons; Stevens, W & H)
- Ex 112 Johnson (R J Woodfin) v Imperial Discount Co, lind (C V Lewis)
- Ex 113 Brooks (Duignan & S) v Phillips & Son (Lewis & L) Harrison (L Lewis) v Crystal Palace Co (H Kimber & Co)
- Ex 114 Coles (H A Stephens) v Dickinson (J Richardson)
- C P 114 Betteley & anr (S Betteley) v Cameron (Smith, F & Son)
- Ex 115 Chambers (T R Apps) v Taylor (W H Fullager)
- Ex 116 Spiller (Same) v Baum (Evans & E)
- Ex 117 Booth (C F Yorke) v London & North-Western Ry Co (R F Roberts) SJ
- C P 118 West London Extension Ry Co (W Heggerty) v London, Chatham & Dover Ry Co (J White) SJ
- Q B 119 Church (Fitch & F) v Hutton (Tidy, H & T)
- Q B 120 Fraser (Simson & Co) v Rollisson & Sons (Bockett & Son) SJ
- Ex 121 Adamson (E Kimber) v General Machinery Co (J B Smith)
- C P 122 Copland (W A Smith) v The Asphaltic Wood Pavement Co, lind (T & A Harrison) SJ
- Q B 123 Paice (Rogers, J & R) v Smith (Bischoff, B & B) SJ
- Ex 124 Shippery (W W Brown) v Lees (E J Barron)
- C P 125 Cochrane (Duncan & Co) v Jordan (Roy & C)
- Ex 126 Hallett (Duncan & Co) v Hallett (In Person)
- Q B 127 Pearks (R Wood) v Earl of Perth & anr (W H Smith)
- Q B 128 Glück & anr (C J Davis) v Beck & anr (L Goldberg) SJ
- Ex 129 De la Rosa (O W Oakes) v Barreto (J Harwood)
- C P 130 Sharpe (J Knight) v Willis (J L Dale)
- Ex 131 Tinlin (J B Lay) v Anderson (Pritchard & M)
- Ex 132 Willis (Evans & E) v Higgins (Speechley & Co)
- Q B 133 Hill (W D Smyth) v Little (Lumley & L) SJ
- Q B 134 Clarke & ors (S Camp) v The Vestry of Chelsea (Lee & Pemberton)
- Q B 135 General Share Trust Co, lind (J S Coleman) v Baum & anr (Evans & E)
- Q B 136 Young (Janson, C & P) v London & North-Western Ry Co (R F Roberts) SJ
- Ex 137 Tulley & ors (E Kimber) v Field (T W Palmer)
- Q B 138 Shore (Foss & L) v Kaufman (J Neal)
- C P 139 Austin (J J Waits) v Liebert (In Person)
- Ex 140 Hall (R Voss) v Smith (A E Francis)
- C P 141 Gray & Poole (Poole & H) v Ellwood Green Colliery & Brick Co, lind (T C Russell)
- Ex 142 Knell (Mackson, T & A) v Webb (De Pere Teanby)
- Q B 143 Whistler (J A Rose) v Ruskin (Walker, M & C) SJ
- Q B 144 Clark (Woolf & Crump) v Swinbourne (Vallance & V)
- C P 145 Long (Paterson, Sons & G) v Millar (Dodd & L)
- Ex 146 Cooper (Roy & C) v Dunn (J T Trengrouse)
- Ex 147 Same (Same) v Samo (Same) (2nd action)
- Q B 148 Burseville (M Abrahams & R) v Whiteley (C M Roche) SJ
- Q B 149 Asquith (J W Sykes) v Brown (Baker & N)
- Ex 150 Society of Apothecaries (Green & P) v Bellairs (W T Ricketts)
- C P 151 Walter Mojen & Son (Walter & M) v Henry (Rogers & Co)
- Q B 152 Delighton (W G Payne) v Rogers (R Howlett)
- C P 153 Cuddon & ors (T Sismey) v Barnes (W T Ricketts) (without a jury)
- C P 154 Drew (F Taylor) v Matthews & anr (J M Updill)
- Ex 155 Hope & anr (W T Ricketts) v Dunham (J J Hutchinson)

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

- May 6.—Messrs. ELLIS & SON, at the Mart, freehold properties, at 2 p.m. (see advertisement, April 13 and 20, p. 4).
- May 8.—Messrs. C. C. TAYLOR & SON, at the Mart, copyhold and leasehold properties, at 2 p.m. (see advertisement, this week, p. 5).
- May 8.—Messrs. BAXTER, PAYNE & LEPPER, at the Mart, freehold properties, at 2 p.m. (see advertisement, this week, p. 5).
- May 8.—Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD, at the Mart, freehold properties, &c., at 2 p.m. (see advertisement, this week, p. 6).
- May 8.—Mr. F. STATHAM HOBSON, at the Mart, policies (see advertisement, April 27, p. 522).
- May 9.—Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE, at the Mart, at 1 for 2 p.m., freehold, copyhold, and leasehold properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 3).
- May 9.—Mr. ROBINS, at the Mart, freehold property (see advertisement, April 13, p. 4).
- May 10.—Messrs. NORTON, TRIST, WATNEY, & CO, at the Mart, freehold properties, at 2 p.m. (see advertisement, April 13 and 20, p. 4).

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

- AGABEG—April 26, at 61, Boundary-road, St. John's wood N.W., the wife of Avist Agabeg, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
- CHUBB—April 28, at South Bank, Forest-hill, the wife of Edward Morley Chubb, solicitor, of a son.
- CLAY—April 26, at 3, Gordon-street, Gordon-square, the wife of William Henry Clay, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
- LEY—April 22, at East Farleigh, near Maidstone, the wife of John Carrington Ley, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
- PARKER—April 16, at Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, the wife of J. T. Parker, solicitor, of a daughter.
- STEWART—April 28, at 22, Neville-street, Onslow-gardens, S.W., the wife of Alan Stewart, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

- BEALL—BRILL—April 30, at St. Mary's, The Boltons, South Kensington, Edward Beall, solicitor, to Edith, daughter of Charles Brill, of Corton House, South Kensington.
- DIXON—PIGGOTT—April 30, at St. Anne's, Highgate-rise, T. Parker Dixon, solicitor, to Florence Maude, daughter of William Peter Piggott.
- FERNS—STEEL—April 24, at Stafford, Alfred Ernest Ferns, solicitor, of Stockport, Cheshire, to Jane Harriet, daughter of the late John Shaw Steel, M.D., of Stafford.
- PETO—EYRE—April 30, at St. James's, Piccadilly, Ernest W. Peto, of 16, Abchurch-lane, E.C., solicitor, to Mary Ellen, daughter of Alexander R. Eyre, of South Park, Sevenoaks.
- SAXTON—PEEK—April 25, at Sydenham, Edward Somee Saxton, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, to Evelyn Meigh, daughter of William Peek, of Shelton, Sydenham-hill.

DEATHS.

- BALL—April 25, at Stroud, Gloucestershire, John Garlick Ball, solicitor, for nearly fifty years coroner for the county, aged 85.
- WELLS—April 30, at 13, Pembroke-road, Kensington, George Wells, barrister-at-law, aged 50.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, April 30, 1878.

- Watts, Alfred Augustus, and Thomas Matthews Cridge, Suffolk, and Essex, solicitors, April 8

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, April 26, 1878.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

- Crown Match Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 18, directed to be heard before the M.R. on May 4. Wheeler, Gray's inn sq., solicitor for the petitioners.
- Great Dyliffs Lead Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 18, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on Friday, May 3. Foss and Legg, Abchurch lane, solicitors for the petitioners.
- London and Caledonian Marine Insurance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 15, directed to be heard before the M.R. on May 4. Waltons and Co, Great Winchester st, solicitors for the petitioners.
- Northern Bohemian Collieries Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 12, directed to be heard before the M.R. on May 4. Tilleard and Co, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioners.
- Patent Steam Engine Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 24, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on May 4. Snell, George st, Mansion House, solicitor for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, April 30, 1878.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

- Bowers Allerton Collieries, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 25, directed to be heard before the M.E. on May 11. Pattison and Co, Queen Victoria st, solicitors for the petitioners.
- British Alliance Assurance Corporation, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 18, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on May 10. Robinson, Philipot Lane, solicitor for the petitioners.
- General Meat Supply Association, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 29, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Friday, May 10. Clark and Co, Lincoln's Inn fields, solicitors for the petitioners.
- Home Investment Society, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 24, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on May 10. Brabant, Gray's Inn sq., solicitor for the petitioners.
- Sutcliffe and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 25, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Friday, May 10. Clark and Co, Lincoln's Inn fields, agents for Brooks and Co, Ashton-under-Lyne, solicitors for the petitioners.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, April 23, 1878.

- Collis, Charles, New Weston st, Bermondsey, Miller. June 1. Collis v. V.C. Hall. Child, William st, Knightsbridge.
- FitzGerald, Maurice Noel Ryder Purcell, Boule Hall, or Woodbridge, Suffolk, Gent. June 1. FitzGerald v. Ryder, V.C. Hall. Davidson and Burch, Spring gardens.
- Foster, Thomas, Oiley, Yock, Farmer. May 29. Foster v. Foster, V.C. Malins. Fullan, Leeds.
- Todd, James, Haworth, York, Yeoman. May 24. Todd v. Todd, V.C. Hall, Lawton, York.

FRIDAY, April 26, 1878.

- Hill, Rev Charles, Eddington, Oxford. May 23. Drewry v. Hill, V.C. Bacon.
- Hill, Rev Charles, Eddington, Oxford. May 23. Drewry v. Hill, V.C. Bacon.
- Neatby, Mary Elizabeth, Gravesend. May 15. Cox v. Boston, V.C. Bacon.
- Peter, John, Holme, Tooley st.
- Peter, John, Park Lane, Esq. Nov 30. Peter v. Stirling, V.C. Malins.
- Lawrence, New sq., Lincoln's Inn.
- Vaughan, Stephen, Eastbourne, Gent. May 21. English and Irish Church and University Assurance Society v. Vaughan, M.R. Waller, Coleman st.
- Young, George, Persnett, Stafford, Hop Merchant. May 23. Osborne v. Young, V.C. Hall. Smith, Dudley.

TUESDAY, April 30, 1878.

- Connor, John, Gloucester st, Clerkenwell. Licensed Victualler. June 1. West London Deposit, Loan and Discount Co Limited v. King, V.C. Hall, Tatham, Queen Victoria st.
- Payne, Charles, Huddersfield, Accountant. May 31. Mossop v. Midgley, V.C. Hall. Learoyd and Co, Huddersfield.
- Vavasour, Marmaduke Walter, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Gent. May 31. Vavasour v. Vavasour, V.C. Bacon. Smith and Mammat, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.
- Wilkes, James, Gravesend, Gent. May 14. Willes v. Willes, V.C. Bacon. Denby, Coleman st.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, April 23, 1878.

- Beasley, John, Holloway road, Fishmonger. May 31. Buckler, Queen st place, Cannon st.
- Davies, Robert Craddock, Worthing, Esq. June 20. Milne and Co, Harcourt buildings, Teamp's.
- Fry, Thomas, Rugby, Warwick, Saddlers. May 27. Wratislaw, Rugby.
- Grainger, Charles, Handsworth, York, Butcher. May 22. Burdakin and Co, Sheffield.
- Hargreaves, Richard, Hulme, Manchester, Beer Retailer. July 6. Bellhouse and Almond, Manchester.
- Johnstone, Mary, Hastings. June 18. Harriman, Bermondsey st.
- Lace, Joshua, Earney Lovett, Christleton, Cheshire, Esq. May 31. Laces and Co, Liverpool.
- Magee, John, Milk st, Merchant. May 20. Rixon, Austin friars.
- Marshall, John, Rossett terrace, Victoria park, Contractor. May 20. Rixon, Austin friars.
- Melvin, George, Wingate, Durham, Gent. June 1. Watson and Smith, Durham.
- McCalfe, William Pitt, Canonbury villas, Islington, Esq. May 24. Croft, Richmond.
- Rendall, Elizabeth Beaton, Hinton, Somerset. June 24. Leach, Marstock.
- Saxton, Nathaniel, Blackfriars bridge Wharf, Blackfriars rd, Timber Merchant. June 4. Willoughby and Cox, Clifford's Inn, Fleet st.
- Smith, Mary, Stafford. June 1. Hand and Co, Stafford.
- Smith, Sarah, Stafford. June 1. Hand and Co, Stafford.
- Stone, John, Epsom, Surrey, Brick Manufacturer. May 28. White, Epsom.
- Suhami, Daniel, Clephane rd, Canonbury, Gent. June 1. Davis, Conduit st, Bond st.
- Tym, Joseph, son, Ludworth, Derby, Coal Merchant. June 1. Johnson, Stockport.
- Waring, George, Shirehampton, nr Bristol, Gent. May 31. Fry and Co, Bristol.
- Watson, Sarah, Ewell. May 28. White, Epsom.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, April 26, 1878.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

- De Fernez, Charles Victor John, and John Henry De Fernez, Little Britain, Costume Manufacturer. Pet April 18. Haasit. May 7 at 12.
- Marcos, Samuel, Fore st, General Merchant. Pet April 18. Haasit. May 7 at 11.

May 4, 1878.

To Surrender in the Country.

Acock, George Thomas, Oxford, Contractor. Pet April 24. Bishop, Oxford, May 13 at 12.

Blake, Frederick, Sheffield, Grocer. Pet Mar 21. Wake, Sheffield, May 6 at 1.

Sherwood, Thomas, Stainton-in-Cleveland, York, Butcher. Pet April 24. Crosby, Stockton-on-Tees, May 9 at 3.

TUESDAY, April 30, 1878.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
To Surrender in London.

Stanbury, Edgar Augustus, Seymour rd, Wandsworth, Colonial Broker. Pet April 27. Hazlitt, May 14 at 11
To surrender in the Country.

Bowers Matthew, Bowles Regis, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet April 26. Walker, Dudley, May 17 at 12.

Creyke, William, Harrogate, Corn Dealer. Pet April 26. Perkins, York, May 14 at 2.

Garrison, Samuel, Cheltenham, Chinaman. Pet April 18. Gale, Cheltenham, May 11 at 11.

Ley, Henry, Melcombe Regis, Dentist. Pet April 27. Symonds, Dorchester, May 15 at 11.

Martinet, Christopher Bradley, Ramsgate, Poultreter. Pet April 26. Fury, Canterbury, May 17 at 2.

Moore, Thomas, Cardiff, Publican. Pet April 18. Langley, Cardiff, May 9 at 2.

Neville, William, High Wycombe, Chair Manufacturer. Pet April 26. Watson, Aylesbury, May 18 at 11.

Scarlett, James, Ipswich, Butcher. Pet April 25. Grimesey, Ipswich, May 18 at 11.

Smyth, Elizabeth Amy Coke, Brighton, Schoolmistress. Pet April 25. Evershed, Brighton, May 20 at 11.

Street, John, Langford, Bedford, Market Gardener. Pet April 26. Pearce, Bedford, May 14 at 11.15.

Wilson, Edward, and Henry Wilson, Charlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester, Decorators. Pet April 25. Lister, Manchester, May 13 at 11.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, April 26, 1878.

Powell, James, Newport, Monmouth, Shoemsmith. April 24

TUESDAY, April 30, 1878.

Barlow, Harriet, High Holborn, Milliner. April 12

Brunning, Arthur James, and Charles Abraham Brunning, Great Yarmouth, Florists. April 25

Cohen, Moses Jonah, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Jeweller. April 9

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, April 26, 1878.

Barnes, Alfred, Accrington, Boiler Coverer. May 10 at 3 at the Peel's Arms Hotel, Whalley rd, Accrington. Whalley, Accrington

Bennell, William, (and not Bennett) Colchester, Plumber. April 30 at 12 at offices of Prior, Head st, Colchester

Benton, Henry, Canock, Stamford, Beer Retailer. May 10 at 11 at offices of Glover, Walsall

Bickerdike, Stead, Leeds, Butcher. April 30 at 3 at offices of Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds

Bridge, George Henry, Farnworth, Lancashire, Spirit Merchant. May 11 at 11 at offices of Watson, Broad st, Bury

Brown, Edward, Langford, Bedford, Butcher. May 10 at 3 at the Swan Hotel, Biggleswade. Nicholson, Biggleswade

Carraher, Hugh Liverpool, Pork Butcher. May 17 at 1 at offices of Green, Clayton sq, Liverpool

Clough, John, Caenby, Lincoln, Farmer. May 14 at 12 at offices of Tweed and Stephen, St Sargeant, Lincoln

Collett, Joseph, Aston-juxta-Birmingham, Baker. May 10 at 3 at offices of Barlow and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Cook, Thomas John, Banham, Norfolk, Engineer. May 4 at 2 at offices of Stanley, Bank Plain, Norwich

Corkhill, John, Liverpool, Cartwoker. May 20 at 3 at offices of Connor, Ranelagh st, Liverpool. Norden and Mason, Liverpool

Darby, George, Eckington, Derby, Boot Dealer. May 14 at 3 at 18, Wardwick, Derby. Hextall, Derby

David, Jacob, Cardiff, Printer. May 6 at 3 at offices of Jones, St Mary st, Cardiff

Dorney, Jerome Vincent, Fenchurch st, Commission Merchant. May 6 at 10 at offices of Morphet and Hanson, Cheapside. Philip, Budge row, Cannon st

Dowmes, John, Mincarrow, Salop, Farmer. May 16 at 3 at the Feathers Hotel, Ludlow. Anderson and D'vies

Dowson, William, Brierley hill, Painter. May 4 at 11 at offices of Homfray and Holerton, High st, Brierley hill

Evans, David, St Martin's, Salop, Grocer. May 10 at 2 at the Public Hall, Oswestry. Minshill, Salop and James

Freck, Robert, Hickling, Nottingham, Baker. May 14 at 3 at the Assembly Rooms, Low pavement, Nottingham. Cranch and Streud, Nottingham

Gilbert, John, Raynforth rd, Bermondsey, Dealer in Machinery. May 15 at 3 at offices of Taylor and Jaquet, South st, Finsbury sq

Gill, Charles, Great Marlow, Bucks, Chair Manufacturer. May 10 at 3 at offices of Rawson, High st, High Wycombe

Goodchild, Thomas, Chiswell st, Finsbury, Pawnbroker. May 14 at 3 at offices of Taylor and Jaquet, South st, Finsbury sq

Gwiliam, Thomas, Leigh, Worcester, Fruit Merchant. May 9 at 11 at offices of Tree and Son, High st, Worcester

Handley, Joseph, Crank Hall, West Bromwich, Farmer. May 10 at 11 at offices of Slater and Marshall, Bartcroft, Darlaston

Hely, Francis Edward, Mark Lane, Wine Merchant. May 22 at 3 at offices of Shaffery and Huntley, Tooley st, Southwark

Hitchen, Joseph, Nantwich, Cheshire, Beer Retailer. May 10 at 11 at 25, Marke st, Crewe. Poitson, Crewe

Hockey, Thomas, and George Robert Allen, Wilton, Wilts, Bakers. May 3 at 12 at offices of Hodder, City chambers, Salisbury

Hudson, John, Bootle, Lancashire, Licensed Victualler. May 21 at 3 at offices of Norden and Mason, Victoria st, Liverpool

Hughes, John, Crewe, Shoemaker. May 3 at 11 at 75, Market st, Crewe. Poitson, Crewe

Hunter, William, Kirby Moorside, York, Draper. May 9 at 10.30 at offices of Harrison, Kirby Moorside

James, David, Neath, Glamorgan, Baker. May 9 at 1 at the Spread Eagle Hotel, Gloucester. Charles, Neath

Jones, Alfred Thomas, Neath, Glamorgan, Grocer. May 9 at 3 at the Spread Eagle Hotel, Gloucester. Charles, Neath

Jones, Hugh Payne, Towny, Merioneth, no occupation. May 9 at 12 at offices of Hughes and Sons, Pier st, Aberystwith

Jones, John, Pen-sarn, Carmarthenshire, Miller. May 2 at 3 at offices of Morris and Morris, Quay st, Carmarthen

Jones, Richard, Glendirl, Shropshire, Innkeeper. May 7 at 11 at the Osborne Hotel, Oswestry. Lewis, Tapster

Knight, Thomas Henry, Bristol, House Decorator. May 10 at 1 at offices of Beckingham, Albion Chambers, Broad st, Bristol

Manning, James, Norwich, Shoe Manufacturer. May 10 at 12 at offices of Daly, Guildhall Chambers, Upper Market, Norwich

Markwell, George, Kentish town, rd, Grocer. May 13 at 2 at 4, Arthur st, East, May and Co, Adelaide place, London bridge

Massey, William, New town, York, Builder. May 2 at 3 at offices of Teale, Albert rd, Middlesbrough

Mitchell, Geo. ge, Birmingham, Builder. May 9 at 11 at offices of Canning and Canning, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Muller, Charles Hermann Louis, West Hartlepool, Timber Merchant. May 13 at 11 at offices of Turnbull and Tilley, Church st, West Hartlepool

Oakey, John, Nottingham, Baker. May 10 at 12 at offices of Fraser, Wheelergate, Nottingham

Pargeter, John, Birmingham, Poultreter. May 9 at 3 at offices of Fallow, Cherry st, Birmingham

Phelan, Michael, Newport, Mon, Merchant. May 10 at 2 at offices of Vaughan, Dock st, Newport

Phillips, Benjamin, Llanelli, Carmarthenshire, Mason. May 13 at 12 at 11, Greenfield place, Llanelli, Snead

Porter, John, Great Dover st, Southwark, Baker. May 10 at 1 at offices of Waring, Borough, Southwark

Robinson, George, Mossley, Lancashire, Butcher. May 13 at 3 at offices of Kershaw, Townhall Chambers, Ashton-under-Lyne

Savidge, Henry, Deeping St James, Lincoln, Publican. May 7 at 1 at offices of Law St Mary's place, Stamford

Sime, John, Llanelli, Pembroke, Farmer. May 9 at 1.30 at the Guildhall, Carmarthen, Gwynne and Stokes, Te, by

Skelton, John, Chelsham, Surrey, Farmer. May 4 at 11 at Rose Cottage, St John's Grove, Croydon

Smallman, Mary, Blakewell, Worcester, Farmer. May 4 at 12 at offices of Coates, Market st, Stourbridge

Smith, Ephraim, Littleport, Cambridge, Ironmonger. May 7 at 2.30 at the Bird Bolt Hotel, Cambridge. Addis, Ely

Smith, James Edward, Northampton, Leather Factor. May 13 at 3 at 4, Burlington Chambers, New st, Birmingham. Michael, Great Winchester st

Smith, Richard William, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Lancashire, Beer Retailer. May 9 at 3 at the Fairstaff Hotel, Market place, Manchester

Tector, William, Bolton, Boot Maker. May 17 at 3 at offices of Taylor and Sons, Mawdesley st, Bolton

Turner, William, Hallas, Hensworth, York, Joiner. May 9 at 3 at offices of Burton, Wood st, Wakefield

Underwood, Harry John, Gloucester, Draper. May 6 at 3 at offices of Haines, St John's lane, Gloucester

Walsh, John, Grayland's road, Peckham, Tailor's Cutter. May 3 at 3 at offices of Chipperfield, Trinity st, Southwark

Waterhouse, William, Birmingham, Coal Dealer. May 4 at 10.15 at offices of East, Cherry st, Birmingham

Watson, Thomas Hosfall, Leeds, Estate Broker. May 9 at 2 at the Queen's Hotel, Leeds. Child

Wilkinson, Josiah, Notting Hill q, Notting Hill, no occupation. May 15 at 3 at offices of Raven and Co, Queen Victoria st

Wilson, John, Middlesbrough, Draper. May 6 at 12 at 8, York st, Middlesbrough

Wilson, Joseph, and Phineas Wilson, Bradford, Builders. May 3 at 11 at offices of Singleton, New Booth st, Bradford

Wood, William Henry, Walsall, Coal Merchant. May 16 at 3 at offices of Glaister, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Woodhouse, Henry, Mile End rd, Bootmaker. May 6 at 3 at offices of Goats, Westminster Bridge rd

TUESDAY, April 30, 1878.

Alsop, Frederick, and John William Tyrrell, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturers. May 13 at 3 at offices of Shosmith, Newland, Northampton

Bailey, John Thornton, Plymouth, Carter. May 13 at 3 at offices of Rouds, Courtney st, Plymouth

Bartlett, George, Birmingham, Tailor. May 14 at 11 at offices of Taylor, Colmore row, Birmingham

Baxter, Joseph, Tunstall, Grocer. May 8 at 2.30 at offices of Hollinshead, Tunstall

Beniman, Thomas, Leekton, York, Farmer. May 13 at 2.30 at the White Horse Inn, Burgrave, Pickering. Harrison, Kirby Moorside

Bennett, John, jun, East India Avenue, Ship Broker. May 16 at 3 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st, Bradley, Mark lane

Blanchard, Thomas, Trowbridge, Milliner. May 10 at 12 at offices of Bottoms, Fore st, Trowbridge

Bottoms, Abel, Barrowash, Derby, Builder. May 15 at 3 at offices of Norton, St James's Chambers, Derby

Bowyer, John Codrington, Frampton Cotterell, Gloucester, Plasterer. May 2 at 12 at offices of Essery, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol

Brook, Charles, Tingley, York, Grocer. May 14 at 3 at the Great Bull Hotel, Westgate, Wakefield. Lister, Wakefield

Brooke, Charles, Upper East Smithfield, Pawnbroker. May 13 at 2 at 81, Gresham st, Saddler, Cannon st

Butterworth, William Patten, Hochdale, Strap Maker. May 13 at 3 at the Railway Hotel, Mifluor rd, Hochdale, Worth, Hochdale

Carijie, John Walter, Nottingham, Draper. May 17 at 12 at offices of Whittingham, Exchange Walk, Nottingham

Carter, George, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. May 14 at 3 at offices of Shires, Market st, Leicester

- Carver, William, Forest Gate, Essex, Butcher. May 15 at 12 at offices of George, Finsbury place, Fenton
- Chapple, James, Newton Abbott, Devon, Stationer. May 11 at 11 at the Craven Hotel, Craven st, Strand. Creed, Newton Abbott
- Clarke, Charles, Epping, Essex, Carpenter. May 13 at 12 at 81, Gresham st. Metcalf, King's Bench walk, Temple
- Close, John, and John Charles Long, Jewry st, Aldgate, Export Drapists. May 25 at 12 at offices of Leslie and Co, Frederick's place, Old Jewry, Lombard and Knight, Austin Friars
- Cloud, John, York, Fishmonger. May 15 at 12 at offices of Wilkinson, St Helen's st, York
- Cookcroft, Thomas, Millwood-in-Tadmorden, York, Cotton Manufacturer. May 14 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Manchester, Eastwood, Tadmorden
- Cole, William, Gateshead, Plumber. May 13 at 12 at offices of Garbutt, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Copsey, William, and William Frank Copsey, Romford, Essex, Upholsterers. May 13 at 12 at offices of Mote, Walthamstow
- Cox, George, Whitstable, Kent, Baker. May 15 at 3.30 at the Bear and Key Hotel, Whitstable. Sankey and Co, Canterbury
- Croby, John, Earlestone, Lancashire, General House Furnisher. May 14 at 3 at offices of Davies and Co, Market place, Warrington
- Daniels, Peter, Middlesborough, Fruiterer. May 10 at 11 at offices of Wilkes, Zetland rd, Middlesborough
- Derbyshire, Edward, and Charles Derbyshire, Liverpool, Merchants. May 15 at 2 at the Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool
- Martin, Liverpool
- Darnbrough, Alfred, Queen st, Cheshire, Wholesale Saddler. May 16 at 3 at offices of Taylor and Jaquet, South st, Finsbury sq
- Davies, David, New Tredegar, Monmouth, Grocer. May 15 at 1 at the Queen's Hotel, Newport, Harris, Tredegar
- Davis, William, Tiverton, Devon, Gent. May 16 at 3 at offices of Dunsford and Co, Fore st, Tiverton
- Denton, Henry Gowthorpe, Beverley, York, Coal Merchant. May 14 at 3 at the Holderness Hotel, Toll Gavel, Beverley. Jordonson and White, nc
- Dickie, James Chalmers, Worcester, Gun Maker. May 16 at 11 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, the Cross, Worcester
- Durrant, Robert William, Central Meat Market, Meat Salesman. May 16 at 3 at offices of Hubbard, London Joint Stock Bank chambers, West Smithfield
- Dutton, Jacob, Hulme, Manchester, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer. May 15 at 11 at offices of Whitt, King st, Manchester. Whitehead, Manchester
- Eaton, Henry John, Hadleigh, Essex, Bricklayer. May 14 at 11 at the Crown Inn, Rayleigh. Wood and Son
- Eaton, William, Cheadle, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. May 9 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, Longton
- Berroyd, John, Oswaldtwistle, Lancashire, Shoe Manufacturer. May 14 at 11 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral Gates, Manchester. Ballard, Accrington
- Edwards, John, and Walter Wylie, Liverpool, Insurance Agents. May 10 at 10.30 at offices of Hornwood and Co, North John st, Liverpool. Grace, Liverpool
- Ellison, William, Croydon, Surrey, Bookseller. May 13 at 2 at offices of Moss, Winchester House, Old Broad st
- Elston, John, North Shields, Builder. May 13 at 3 at offices of Duncan and Duncan, Market place, South Shields
- Feather, Thomas, and William Lund, Keighley, Machine Makers. May 10 at 2.30 at offices of Robinson and Robins, Keighley
- Gardiner, Addin, Eccles, Lancashire, Commission Agent. May 13 at 2 at offices of Tidswell, Brazennose st, Manchester
- Gate, Ruth, and Robert Gate, Westgate, York, Brush Manufacturers. May 15 at 2 at the Station Hotel, Batley. Scholes and Son, Dewsbury
- Goddard, John, jun, Great Grimsby, Stonemason. May 9 at 11 at offices of Grange and Wintingham, St Mary's chambers, West St Mary's gate, Great Grimsby
- Godley, Richard, Bailey Carr, York, Contractor. May 13 at 10.30 at offices of Ridgway and Ridgway, Union st, Dewsbury
- Gray, Henry, Kingston-upon-Hull, Ship Chandler. May 15 at 11 at the George Hotel, Kingston-upon-Hull. Cross, Hull
- Green, Robert, Greenwich, Kent, Chemist. May 13 at 3 at offices of Hepburn and Sons, Cheapside
- Hall, James Gibb, Warrington, Engineer. May 13 at 3 at offices of Davies and Co, Bewsey st, Warrington. Brook, Warrington
- Hannam, Thomas, Oldham, Cotton Waste Dealer. May 10 at 3 at offices of Roberts, Marston st, Manchester
- Hanson, Joseph, Cleckheaton, York, Chemist's Assistant. May 13 at 3 at offices of Lancaster and Wright, Manor row, Bradford
- Harrison, Charles, Sheffield, Draper. May 13 at 12 at offices of Auty and Son, Queen st, Sheffield
- Hilton, James, Little Bolton, Bootmaker. May 16 at 3 at offices of Richardson, Wood st, Bolton
- Hirst, Joseph, Padlock, nr Huddersfield, Flock Merchant. May 13 at 11 at offices of Drake, John William st, Huddersfield
- Croll, John, and John Cockaday, Manchester, Tailors. May 13 at 4 at 6, Vigo st, London. Haughton, Manchester
- Holman, William, Worth, Sussex, Grocer. May 10 at 12.30 at offices of Morrison, High st, Rotherham
- Hulme, Thomas, Ormskirk, Lancashire, Hairdresser. May 14 at 3 at offices of Tomkins, L d rd st, Liverpool
- Hulton, James Fussell Mells, Southport, Edge Tool Manufacturer. May 21 at 3.30 at the Incorporated Law Society, Aldermoor court, High st, Sheffield. Yates and Co, Liverpool
- James, David, Neath, Glamorgan, Baker. May 9 at offices of Charles, The Parade, Neath, in lieu of the place originally named
- Jones, Thomas, New Cross, Kent, out of business. May 15 at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Howard, Greenwich
- Jenner, John Henry, Manchester, Importer of Fancy Goods. May 13 at 3 at offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester
- Jones, Samuel, Curtain rd, Shoreditch, Chair Manufacturer. May 13 at 11 at offices of Breckells, Guildhall chambers, Fulcher, Horton rd, Hackney
- Kelvie, John Mercer, Red Lion court, Watling st, Mancunian Manufacturer. May 13 at 10 at offices of Evans and Eagles, John st, Bedford row
- Kenworthy, Charles, Carr, York, Woolen Spinner. May 14 at 3 at the Town Hall chambers, Ashton-under-Lyne. Greenfield
- Kirkham, Frederick, Macclesfield, Painter. May 13 at 11 at offices of Froggatt, Banks buildings, Chestergate, Macclesfield
- Knight, Llewellyn, Birmingham, Optician. May 13 at 11 at offices of Carr, Co'more row, Birmingham
- Krammar, Joel, Plummer's row, Commercial rd, east, Fish Salesman. May 16 at 2 at offices of Brighten and Parker, Bishopsgate st without
- Lane, David, Kidderminster, Earthenware Dealer. May 15 at 3 at the Chess Room, Townhall, Kidderminster. Saunders, son, and Butcher Kidderminster
- Laurence, Martin, Newport, Mon, Tailor. May 15 at 2 at offices of Paine and Son, Dick st, Newport
- Lee, John, jun, Weiney, Cambridge, Engineer. May 16 at 11 at the Bell Hotel, Ely. Rogers, Ely
- Levy, Isaac, New st, Houndsditch, Grocer. May 22 at 2 at 40, Bishopsgate st, without. Barnard, White Lion st
- Levy, Leon, Strand, Portmannean Manufacturer. May 14 at 3 at 8, Fleet st. Levy, Surrey st, Strand
- Liefold, Joseph, David, Marlborough terrace, Upper Holloway, Plumber. May 15 at 12 at offices of Brown, Goswell rd
- Lightbown, James, Bath, Printer. May 9 at 12 at offices of Crutwell, Harrington place, Queen sq, Bath
- Marshall, William, Wolverhampton, Broker. May 11 at 11 at offices of Dallow, Queen sq, Wolverhampton
- Mason, George, Folbourn, Cambridge, Carpenter. May 11 at 12 at offices of Ellison and Co, Alexandra st, Petty Cury
- Morey, Owen, High Holborn, Licensed Victualler. May 16 at 2 at offices of Layton and Co, Budge row
- Nathan, John, Portsea, Midimer. May 15 at 2 at 145, Cheapside, Whitefriars, Portsea
- Nicholls, Saunders Fawcett, and William Shapland, Bristol, Billiard Table Manufacturers. May 10 at 12 at offices of Tribe and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol. Brittan and Co, Bristol
- O'Connell, James Daniel, Trafigura bridge, Peckham, Coal Merchant. May 16 at 2 at office of Pettingill, Walbrook
- Oddy, Joshua, Batley Cart, York, Bootmaker. May 14 at 3 at offices of Stapleton, Union st, Dewsbury
- Pace, John Silverdale, Stafford, Bootmaker. May 11 at 10.30 at offices of Turner, Bagnall st, Newcastle-under-Lyme
- Palmer, William, Leeds, General Dealer. May 13 at 11 at offices of Forn and Warren, Albion st, Leeds
- Parrington, Alfred, St Thomas the Apostle, Devon, Chaundler Manufacturer. May 11 at 4 at the Swan Inn, Cowick st, St Thomas the Apostle
- Paul, William Young, Chipping Norton, Oxford, Travelling Draper. May 17 at 12 at the Lans of Court Hotel, Holborn. Kirby and Mace, Chipping Norton
- Peach, Charles Henry, Plumstead, Grocer. May 16 at 3 at offices of Aird, Essex-chapel
- Preston, David, Nottingham, Builder. May 17 at 12 at offices of Fraser, Wheegate, Nottingham
- Price, George, and Charles Price, Bromyard, Hereford, Boot Manufacturers. May 10 at 12 at offices of Knott, Forgate st, Worcester
- Frye, William Hanley, Fruiter Salesman. May 11 at 11 at offices of Sutton, Hill Top, Burslem
- Prior, Francis Loder, Great James st, Bedford row, Beer Merchant. May 13 at 3 at offices of Kelley, Great James st, Bedford row
- Prosser, Thomas, Bristol, Beernouse Keeper. May 11 at 12 at offices of Clinton, Broad st, Bristol
- Reynolds, George, Blackfriars rd, Southwark, Boot Manufacturer. May 18 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Mason, North buildings, Finsbury
- Richardson, John Robert, Kent green, Cheshire, Builder. May 15 at 3 at offices of Tomkinson, Hanover st, Burslem
- Robinson, Thomas Henry, Leeds, Plumber. May 13 at 3 at offices of Hardwick, Infirmary st, Leeds
- Sargent, George Pearce, Dorrell place, Brixton rd, Doctor of Medicine. May 15 at 2 at offices of Norris, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane
- Searle, Henry, and Thomas Finney, Coleman st, Tailor. May 16 at 3 at offices of Saffery and Co, Old Jewry chambers, Old Jewry. Dunn and Palmer, London wall
- Seymour, Luke, Jameson Seymour, and Elisabeth Seymour, Dalton-le-Dale, Durham, Farmers. May 20 at 1 at offices of Wright, Tempest place, Shahan Harbour
- Shapcott, James, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Tailor. May 15 at 1 at 16, Regent st, Cheltenham. Chesshyre
- Sharp, Francis William, Blumham, Bedford, Plumber. May 14 at 11 at offices of Mitchell and Webb, St Paul's sq, Bedford
- Sianey, Charles, Bradley Green, Stafford, Boot Maker. May 13 at 11 at offices of Cooper, Townhall chambers, Congleton
- Smith, David, Cheetham, Birmingham, Grocer. May 14 at 3 at offices of the Creditors' Association of Wholesale Dealers, Arthur st, East Smith, Joseph, St Albans, Berkford, Draper. May 16 at 3 at the George Hotel, St Albans. Annesley, St Albans
- Smith, Richard, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. May 13 at 3 at offices of Hodgeson and Haigh, Waterloo st, Birmingham
- Smith, Samue, Sheffield, Boot Dealer. May 13 at 12 at offices of Hawkin, Change alley, Sheffield
- Smith, William, Girlington, York, Draper. May 9 at 3 at offices of the Creditor's Association, Parkinson's chambers, Market st, Bradford
- Sorton, Levi, Salford, Lancashire, Grocer. May 15 at 11 at offices of Sutton and Elliott, Fontain st, Manchester
- Straight, John, Ashton-under-Hill, Gloucester, Butcher. May 13 at 2 at the Three Tuns Inn, Pershore. Quarrel, Worcester
- Star, James, Huddersfield, Paper Maker. May 9 at 3 at offices of Learoyd and Co, Buxton rd, Ilkley
- Stott, Walter, Everton, nr Liverpool, Hosier. May 13 at 3 at offices of Collins and Co, Union court, Castle st, Liverpool
- Summers, Edwin Thomas, Birmingham, out of business. May 13 at 3 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham
- Taylor, Edward, and Edward Taylor, jun, East Coker, Somerset, Twine Manufacturers. May 13 at 11 at the Three Coughs Hotel, Yeovil, Yeovil
- Teall, Robert, Handsworth, Stafford, out of business. May 13 at 3 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham
- Tregenza, John, Budleigh Salterton, Devon, Builder. May 13 at 3 at the Castle Hotel, Castle st, Exeter. Floud, Exeter

Walford, James Hare, New Broad st, Wine Merchant. May 16 at 2 at offices of Baker and Co, Cloak lane, Cannon st.
 Walker, Richard, Newby, York, Farmer. May 11 at 11 at offices of Robson, Linthorpe rd, Middlesborough.
 Walsh, Henry, Cheltenham-upon-Medlock, Manchester, Peatlayer. May 21 at 2 at the Artillery Arms, Anfield grove, Ardwick, Tremereen, Deansgate.
 Watson, Edwin Timble, Newington, York, Photographer. May 11 at 11 at the George Hotel, Kingston-upon-Hull. Jackson, Hull.
 Wand, William Othniel, and Frederick Charles Graves, Crown court, Milton st, Printers. May 14 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st, Eltham, King's Arms yard.
 Wetherill, William Thomas, Over Darwen, Lancashire, Power Loom Cloth Manufacturer. May 14 at 11 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral yard, Manchester. Radcliffe, Blackburn.
 White, George, Tiverton hill, Somerset, Mason. May 10 at 11 at offices of Wilton and Sons, Westgate buildings, Bath.
 Whifford, Alison, West Hartlepool, Commission Agent. May 11 at 11 at offices Best, Market cross chambers, Stockton-on-Tees.
 Williams, Daniel, Treherbert, Glamorgan, Grocer. May 10 at 3.30 at the Queen's Hotel, St Mary st, Cardiff.
 Williams, David, Southport, Lodging house Keeper. May 14 at 3 at 1, Barratt st, Southport. Jones and Pride, Liverpool.
 Wilson, George, Hunslet, nr Leeds, Butcher. May 13 at 2 at offices of Rookes and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar Lane, Leeds.
 Wilson, William, South Shields, Cabinet Maker. May 13 at 11 at offices of Kewney, Howard st, North Shields.
 Winakil, Charles Frederick, Linthorpe, nr Middlesborough, Painter. May 6 at 3 at offices of Hope, Zetland rd, Middlesborough.
 Woolley, Herbert, Weston-on-Trent, Derby, Blacksmith. May 13 at 3 at offices of Briggs, Amen alley, Derby.
 Young, Joseph Goswell rd, Clerkenwell, Butcher. May 14 at 2 at offices of Baines, Basinghall st, Mason, North buildings, Finsbury.

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly recommended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas THICKENED, yet WEAKENED with starch, &c., and in REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA à LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., &c., by Chemists and Grocers. Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,

H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

PAINLESS DENTISTRY.

MR. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, LONDON

(Immediately opposite the British Museum),

Has obtained Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent for his perfectly painless system of adapting

(Prize Medal, London and Paris)

ARTIFICIAL TEETH BY ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE.

Pamphlet gratis and Post-free.

EDE AND SON

ROBE



MAKERS

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To His Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS, &c.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION.—Students "engaged" by a Gentleman of NINE YEARS' practical legal experience. Good references if required. Terms moderate.—OMEGA, 1, Peets-corner, Westminster.

LAW EXAMINATIONS.—Mr. ALBERT ST. PAUL (M.A. Oxon), Solicitor, prepares gentlemen for their Preliminary, Intermediate, and Final Examinations, either privately, or in class. Resident pupils received.—Address, 11, Staple-inn, London, W.C.

MESSRS. SLADDEN, SON, and TURNER'S REGISTER OF LAW PARTNERSHIPS, TRANSFERS, &c., is under the personal management of the head of the firm, a Solicitor, retired from active practice, holding high office in a Metropolitan County Court.—Offices: 44, Bedford-row, London, W.C.

On May 6. Price 5s.

LAW MAGAZINE and REVIEW, and QUARTERLY DIGEST OF ALL REPORTED CASES.

NO. CCXXXVIII. FOR MAY.

CONTENTS:

1. Codification and Legal Education. By Mr. Justice MARK BY.
2. The Inclosure Acts and Common Rights. By FREDERIC GREEN, M.A., Barrister-at-Law.
3. Practical Legislation. By FRANCIS SAVAGE REILLY, Barrister-at-Law.
4. On the Study of the Law. By CHARLES CLARK, Q.C.
5. Scottish Criminal Procedure; its Lessons for England. By ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, M.A., Barrister-at-Law.
6. Parish Registers. By T. P. TASWELL-LANGMEAD, B.C.L., Barrister-at-Law.
7. Select Cases—Scottish. By HUGH BARCLAY, LL.D.
8. Legal Obligations of the Quarter.
9. Reviews of New Books.
10. Quarterly Notes.
11. Quarterly Digest of all Reported Cases.

STEVENS & HAYNES, Bell Yard, Temple Bar.

Now Ready, Second Edition, price 1s., cloth.

THE LAW of LANDLORD and TENANT.

By HORACE SMITH, B.A., and T. SPOONER SODEN, M.A., Esq., Barristers-at-Law. Second Edition, enlarged, with Forms.

London: DAVIS & SON, 57, Carey-street, Lincoln's-Inn, W.C.

LAW FIRE INSURANCE OFFICE,

114, Chancery-lane, London, 24th April, 1878.

Notice is hereby given that the ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the Shareholders of the Law Fire Insurance Society will be held at the Society's Office, Chancery-lane, on Tuesday, the 7th day of May next, to elect Eight Directors in the room of the like number of Directors who go out by rotation; and also to elect Four Auditors, and for general purposes. And that an EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING of the shareholders will likewise be held at the place aforesaid for the election of a Director in the room of William Strickland Cookson, Esq., deceased, the business of the said Extraordinary General Meeting to take place immediately after the termination of the business of the Annual General Meeting.

The chair will be taken at one o'clock precisely.

The Directors going out by rotation are:—

Francis Thomas Birchen, Esq.	John Moxon Clabon, Esq.
William Thomas Carlisle, Esq.	John Robert Daniel-Tyssen, Esq.
Arnold William White, Esq.	Bartle John Laurie Frere, Esq.
George Cooper, Esq.	Charles Norris Wilde, Esq.

They are eligible and offer themselves for re-election.

The Auditors retiring are:—

Edward Francis Bigg, Esq.	Frederick Morgan, Esq.
Octavius Leefe, Esq.	William Tanner Neve, Esq.

They are eligible and offer themselves for re-election.

The Candidates for the vacant seat at the Board of Directors are Frederick George Davidson, Charles Cheston, and George Thompson Powell, Esq.

By order of the Board,

GEORGE WILLIAM BELL, Secretary.

CLERICAL, MEDICAL, AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

13, St. James's Square, London, S.W.

City Branch: Mansion House Buildings, E.C.

FINANCIAL RESULTS.

The Annual Income exceeds	£273,000
The Assurance Fund is over	£267,000
The New Policies in the last year were 544, assuring	£238,15
The New Annual Premiums were	£29,082
The Total Claims by Death paid, amount to	£3,726,734
The Subsisting Assurances and Bonuses amount to	£2,356,382

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES.

Credit of half the first five Annual Premiums allowed on whole-term Policies on healthy Lives not over 60 years of age.

Endowment Assurances granted, without Profits, payable at death or attaining a specified age.

Invalid Lives assured at rates proportioned to the risk.

Claims paid thirty days after proof of death.

BONUS.

The Reversionary Bonus at the Quinquennial Division in January, 1877 (amounting to £257,014), averaged 50 per cent., and the Cash Bonus 30 per cent., on the Premiums paid in the 5 years.

The Next Division of Profits will take place in January, 1882, and Persons who off-set New Policies before the end of June next will be entitled at that Division to one year's additional share of Profits over later Entrants.

REPORT, 1877.

The 13th Annual Report just issued, and the Balance Sheets for the year ending June 30, 1877, as rendered to the Board of Trade, can be obtained at either of the Society's Offices, or of any of its Agents.

GEORGE CUTCLIFFE, ACTUARY AND SECRETARY.

COMMISSION.

10 per cent. on the First Premium, and 5 per cent. on Renewals, is allowed to Solicitors. The Commission will be continued to the person introducing the Assurance, without reference to the channel through which the Premiums may be paid.